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ABSTRACT

Consumers select a product based on numerous product characteristics. Numerous studies conducted earlier revealed that consumers in developing countries preferred products made in western or developed countries because their product quality is better than the quality of local products (Lee & Nguyen, 2017; Dao & Heidt, 2018; Rodrigo et al., 2019). Moreover, consumers are increasingly concerned about manufacturers’ environmental issues. Although ethical consumers believe that eco-products could save the environment, some consumers are not concerned about the eco-products and thus select products based on other product attributes (Joshi & Rahman, 2015). Hence, it becomes very challenging for retailers to select a country among developed or developing countries to manufacture eco-friendly products and understand how consumer knowledge of eco-product and ethnocentrism affect consumers’ perceived consumption values.

To address this problem, this study explored whether economic development status (a domestic developed country vs. a foreign developing country) and an eco-product (eco- vs. non-eco product) influence consumers’ perceived consumption values and how consumption values influence consumers’ purchase intentions, considering the different levels of moderating effects of ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-products. The proposed model begins with the link between dependent variables (i.e., perceived consumption values) and independent variables (i.e., economic development status and eco-products) and two moderators (i.e., ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-product) between these two variable sets.

The proposed model developed six (H1 to H6) hypotheses. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), the process macro (Hayes, 2018) and regression analysis were used to analyze the developed hypotheses. The results revealed that economic development status showed significant...
effects on consumers’ consumption values and ethnocentrism showed a significant moderation role between economic development status and consumers’ consumption values. However, the interactional effect of eco/non-eco products with economic development status results showed an insignificant outcome. At the same time, this study also found an insignificant effect of eco/non-eco product on consumers’ consumption values and an insignificant moderation effect of knowledge of eco-products on the relationship between eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) and consumption values. Based on the findings, insightful theoretical contributions and managerial implications are discussed. Lastly, the study concludes with its limitations and future research recommendations.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

When do you see the tag in apparel product that says, “Made in Bangladesh,” what does it mean to you? Similarly, if the product label made in the USA or China which have different economic development status can make you have different perceptions of the product. It is currently widely accepted that the economic development status of the country has a worldwide impact, either positively or negatively, on consumers’ perception of the product and ultimately on their attitude towards the product and their intention to purchase it and also, companies operating in the international market (Miranda, 2020). According to Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999), variations of economic development status are an important factor underlying the country-of-origin effect on the evaluation of products.

According to Statista (n. d.), the meaning of the “made in” label is more important than ever. Statista developed the Made-in-Country-Index (MICI) which indicated the standard value of brand strength and transparent evaluations of the value of label in different countries. The Made-in-Country-Index (MICI) was constructed based on 43,034 consumer sample worldwide from 52 nations. This number of consumer samples represents 90 percent of the global population. The study found that quality, security standards, value for money, uniqueness, design, advanced technology, authenticity, sustainability, fair production, and status symbol were the most important criteria to select a product. In another study conducted by Statista (n.d.), 33% of US consumers perceived production conditions as important, 38% as partly important, and
29% did not perceive it as important when buying apparel for themselves. At the same time, 20% US consumers showed eco-friendliness as important and vital when choosing apparel products.

According to NielsenIQ, the US sustainability market will be expected to reach $150 billion sales by 2021 (“Was 2018 the year,” 2018). Sustainability will be becoming a significant trend in the fashion industry, as the environmental concerns are increasingly top of consumers’ minds. They also mentioned that the fashion industry is one of the biggest culprits when it comes to the questions about pollution. The United States Environmental Protection Agency reported that 26 billion pounds of textiles end up in landfills each year (Elven, 2018). According to Holbrook (2019), a consumer intelligence provider “Toluna” issued a report highlighting consumers’ desire to support brands that use sustainability concept in their product manufacturing process. The report showed that the perception of sustainability among US consumers is increasing, and they are willing to pay 5% more for environmentally friendly products. At the same time, the report mentioned that consumer attention toward the environment is strengthened and consumers of all ages were either “very” or “extremely” environmentally conscious. Some recent ethical initiatives have been taken by renowned brands such as J Crew to increase the transparency in material sourcing (Euromonitor International, 2019). Apart from these initiatives, taken by the retailers, Google Play and App Store have launched some apps (i.e., Faer, Good On You) for consumers to see the ethical product’s detailed information on mobile, evaluate the ethical brands, and assess how the brands maintain the fair working condition of the collected products.

In 2019, the current total apparel and footwear market value in the United States was about 368 billion dollars (Coresight Research, n.d.). In a study conducted by Statista (n.d.), 20% of US consumers showed eco-friendliness as important, 43% as partly important, and 33% did
not perceive it as important when choosing apparel products. In Choi and Johnson’s (2019) study, 90% of the US consumers were concerned about purchasing that can affect the environment, implying that the US consumers are willing to change purchasing behavior to improve the environment.

In addition, negative environmental issues affect consumers to be more selective in buying brands. Brands like Adidas and Everlane made their products entirely from recycled plastics, and the North Face took an initiative to sell refurbished apparel so that it can reduce the wasteful consumption (Euromonitor International, 2019). According to Shen et al. (2012), consumers are now becoming more conscious of the material utilized in their apparel products and the material suppliers; the supply chain should be transparent and ethical; and should involve harmless chemicals and ingredients.

In this era of sustainable consumption, consumers are now demanding more transparency about the product supply chain and aware of every step of fashion product manufacturing process (Euromonitor International, 2019; Yang et al., 2017; Yoo et al., 2018). As the requirement of transparency is increasing day by day, retailers are adopting a more sustainable business model. Due to the concern of consumers about the product transparency, different leading famous brands in the US market, apart their own manufacturing unit, increasingly import apparel products from various countries such as developing countries (low-cost market), developed countries. According to OTEXA (Office of Textiles and Apparel), apparel in the US market was imported from China (33.06%), Vietnam (14.82%), Bangladesh (6.47%), Indonesia (5.44%), and India (4.60%) (Major Shipping Reports, 2019).

Yang et al. (2017) also stated that specifying retailers as “ecological gatekeepers” could mitigate the environmental concern involved in the channel between the suppliers and the
consumers. Some recent ethical initiatives have been taken by renowned brands such as J Crew to increase the transparency in material sourcing (Euromonitor International, 2019). Fashion brands are now divided into two segments, namely fast fashion and slow fashion. Khandual and Pradan (2018) mentioned that fast fashion brands like H&M maintain their production transparency considering environment and consumers. Slow fashion brands are more concerned about the factory’s fair and ethical production. The authors argued it could provide a safe working environment to the workers, use organic cotton, recycle products, raw materials, and end-use waste materials.

Leading global apparel companies such as Zara (Inditex), H&M, and Uniqlo fast fashion companies worldwide have production supply chain units. Products were designed and manufactured in domestic/local developed or developing countries. Selecting a country based on economic development status is in line with the business model and strategy of the company. For example, H&M outsources manufacturing to countries with cheap labor, and Zara outsources some production units from low-cost producing countries (Parietti, 2019).

Walsh et al. (2014) mentioned that consumers’ perceived consumption value has a widely potential opportunity to measure different perceived value in international retailing and they found that consumers’ different perceived consumption values may exist as a ubiquitous shopping-related influence that permeates many aspects of consumptions for many individuals worldwide. According to Sheth et al. (1991), consumption values widely relate to consumers’ attitudes and behavior; and they argued that different values influence consumers’ trust and faith in buying a product. Based on the growing environmental concerns among consumers, retailers are now more mindful of how the eco-friendly products influence consumers’ perceived consumption values. This environmental concern stimulates retailers to get more involved in
eco-products’ sourcing. In this competitive market, retailers must understand how and why the US consumers’ consumption values influence choosing products designed or manufactured based on economic development status such as domestic country relative to a foreign developing country considering the environmental concerns.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Consumers select a product based on numerous product aspects. According to Boyle (2021), economic development status is classified based on gross domestic product (GDP) or gross national income (GNI) per capita of a country. The United Nations (UN) described economic development status as the reflection of basic economic country conditions. The author also mentioned that countries may be classified either developed or developing based on GDP (Gross domestic product) or GNI (Gross national income) (Boyle, 2021). A developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country (Surbhi, 2020). On the other hand, a developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country (Surbhi, 2020). Numerous studies conducted earlier revealed that consumers in developing countries preferred products made in western or developed countries because their product quality is better than the quality of local products (Dao & Heidt, 2018; Lee & Nguyen, 2017; Rodrigo et al., 2019).
Consumers are increasingly concerned about manufacturers’ environmental issues, and leading companies seek manufacturing sources for eco-friendly products (Joshi & Rahman, 2015). Although ethical consumers believe that eco-products could save the environment, some consumers are not concerned about the eco-products and thus select products based on other product attributes.

Moreover, Shen et al. (2012) argued that the fashion industry’s reputation depends on its business’ social and environmental initiative. Hence, it becomes very challenging for retailers to select a country based on economic development status to manufacture eco-friendly products and understand how the consumer knowledge of eco-product and ethnocentrism affects consumers’ perceived consumption values. To address this problem, this study examines whether economic development status and eco/non-eco products influence consumers’ perceived consumption values and how consumption values influence consumers’ purchase intentions, considering different levels of ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-products. Therefore, to fill this void, this research model investigates whether economic development status and product types influence consumers’ different consumption values and behavioral intentions.

The following research questions are established:

RQ1: How does the economic development status (a domestic developed country vs. a foreign developing country) affect consumers’ perceived consumption values (i.e., emotional, social, and functional value)?

RQ2: How do the eco/non-eco products affect consumers’ perceived consumption values (i.e., emotional, social, and functional value)?
RQ3: How do the economic development status and eco/non-eco products interplay to influence consumers’ perceived consumption values?

RQ4: How do the perceived consumption values influence consumers’ purchase intentions?

RQ5: Does ethnocentrism moderate the relationship between economic development status and consumption values?

RQ6: Does knowledge of eco-products moderate the relationship between eco/non-eco product and consumption values?

1.3. DISSEPTION ORGANIZATION

The dissertation is made up of five chapters. Chapter One (introduction) sets out the background to this study, the problem statement, research questions, the purpose of the study, and the definition of terms. Chapter Two (literature review) provides the theoretical background information used in this study and extensive reviews of the key constructs of this study. Also, this chapter addresses hypotheses development considering independent variables and their interactive influences on consumers’ consumption values, and the development process of the research model are discussed in this chapter.

Chapter Three (methods) describes the development process of stimuli, manipulation to develop fictitious ads, information about the sampling, survey procedure, sample demographic characteristics, measurement development, and result of validity test.

Chapter Four (data analysis and results) describes the quantitative methods, data analyses, and result outcomes. This chapter includes analysis of variance (ANOVA), the process
macro (Hayes, 2020) and regression analysis to analyze the hypotheses. The flow of this chapter includes a data screening and manipulation check, the sample characteristics, the reliabilities of the scale items, and hypotheses testing using statistical analysis.

Chapter Five (discussion and implications) concludes the research by explaining the results of the data analysis. This chapter also suggests theoretical contributions to the literature and managerial implications for marketing professionals. Finally, this chapter concludes by discussing the research limitations and emphasizing some potential future research recommendations.

1.4. DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

The current study will evaluate the influence of economic development status and eco/non-eco products on consumers’ perceived consumption values and how consumption values influence consumers’ purchase intentions, considering different levels of ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-product. The definitions of the key constructs in this study are presented in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic development status</td>
<td>Economic development status is defined based on gross domestic product (GDP) or gross national income (GNI) per capita of a country. The United Nations (UN) described economic development status as the reflects of basic economic country conditions and human development index (HDI) is a system of measurement that employed to assess this construct.</td>
<td>Boyle (2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-products</td>
<td>The word “Eco” is one integral component of sustainable fashion, and sometimes eco-products or eco-fashion are looked at as synonyms for sustainable fashion. Eco-products are defined as products that do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings.</td>
<td>Khandual and Pradhan (2018); Tan (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>The concept of ethnocentrism was designed to capture one’s cognitions and emotions related to product offers by another countries (Shimp, 1984). According to Shrimp (1984), consumer ethnocentrism was defined to capture the normative-based beliefs of a consumer that buying foreign products is harmful to the country’s economy, the country, and the citizens and on the other hand, buying domestic products is good for the country.</td>
<td>Shrimp (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of eco-product</td>
<td>The definition of the general eco-product attitude of consumers and the use or disposal behavior of waste recycling was greatly affected by product awareness or knowledge and its effect on the environment.</td>
<td>Shim (1995)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Definitions of key constructs (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption values</td>
<td>The definition of consumption value represents the consumer’s complete evaluation of the usefulness of a product or service based on the perception of experienced and existing presentation of a product or a service.</td>
<td>Zeithaml (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional value is described as the perceived usefulness obtained from an alternative’s ability to boost emotional states.</td>
<td>Sheth et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social</td>
<td>Social value is denoted as the perceived usefulness derived from specific social groups, and social value groups are considered demographic, socioeconomic, and cultural-ethnic groups.</td>
<td>Sheth et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Functional</td>
<td>Functional value is referred to as the perceived usefulness derived from a functional, utilitarian, or physical presentation of a product.</td>
<td>Sheth et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>Purchase intentions reflect consumer intentions to buy products or services on the basis of product attitudes, emotions, and predicted or planned future behaviors.</td>
<td>Engel et al. (1990); Phau et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER TWO  
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As the research aims to identify the roles of economic development status of the country, eco/non-eco products in consumers’ perceived consumption values, and purchase intentions, the attribution theory and the theory of consumption values will be used in this study to explain the relationships among these constructs.

2.1.1. Attribution Theory

According to Malle (2011), the phenomenon of attribution represents two behavioral clarifications; the first one is explaining the behavior and the second one is understanding traits from the behavior. The seminal concept of attribution theory was first introduced by Fritz Heider (1958) in his book “The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations” and has been a central focus of psychology research. Fritz Heider developed the attribution theory for both the object perceptions and person perceptions. First, he described the attribution theory based on object perception, and later he found that the process of attribution was involved in person perceptions. He found that person perceptions are more complex than object perception due to various causes (such as beliefs, desires, emotions, traits.) (Malle, 2011). According to Heider (1958), the behavior of an individual can be explained by two types of attributions: dispositional (internal causes) and situational (external causes). Internal attributions explain individual acts in some manner because of his personality characteristics, motives or attitudes, while the external attributions refer to the caused derived from the environment he finds himself. For example, Fu
and Liang (2018) mentioned that internal attributions (i.e., personality traits such as ecological consciousness, social consciousness) and external attributions (i.e., availability of new and different fashion products) influenced millennial eco-fashion purchase intention and willingness to pay more for eco-fashion. Fritz Heider’s (1958) seminal concept of attribution theory has been extensively used in educational studies, law, sports psychology, clinical and counseling psychology, environmental psychology, and interpersonal relations studies (Kelly & Michela, 1980; Weiner 1986).

Next, the core concept of attribution theory was explained by Burnkrant (1975). According to Burnkrant (1975), the core concept of attribution theories addressed how people infer a situation or a product from limited available resources, unobservable attributes, or the depositions about the objects and organisms in their environment. This study also mentioned that the confidence in the object’s interpretation would be higher if the attribution consequences of all the cues associated with the object were more consistent than if they were inconsistent. Also, Burnkrant (1975) stated that Fritz Heider’s (1958) seminal concept of attribution theory on the issue of how people attribute causes differences in the environment and later, this concept was expanded by Jones and Davis’ (1965) and Kelley’s (1967) in theory of correspondent inferences and presentation of attribution theory in social psychology. Jones and Davis’ (1965) correspondence theory explained how and when is appropriate to infer a person’s personality correspondence to his or her behavior. Kelley’s (1967) mentioned that four criteria distinctiveness, consistency of over time, consistency of over modality, and consensus were relevant to attribution process. Both works specified the conditions under which observers could infer unobservable depositions or attributes in the organisms or objects they encounter. These
contributions had a significant impact on the consequences for consumer behavior applications of attribution theory (Burnkrant, 1975).

According to Kelly and Michela (1980), attribution refers to the perception or inference of cause. According to this theory, the main concept is related to cause and reactions. People interpret their behavior due to causes that are antecedents of attribution, and these interpretations work in determining the reaction of the behavior, which is a consequence of attribution. In the attribution process, the authors implied that people process information based on the surroundings and others’ behavior to infer possible causes.

Weiner (1986) developed the theoretical framework of attribution theory and described that human behavior is triggered by attribution in three ways: (1) observing others’ behavior; (2) believing the purpose of the behavior; and (3) causing others to perform the same behavior or not. In 1992, Weiner, in his book “Human motivation: Metaphors, Theories, and Research,” described the attribution theory that when people interact with some unexpected situation, then they show different cognitive and affective reactions (Weiner, 1992). Next, in 2000, Weiner explained two fundamentals attribution theory principles that examined the consumer’s psychology. The authors argued that perceptions of causations influence the anticipated product satisfaction (stability dimension), and perceptions of causations influence judgments (controllability dimensions) (Weiner, 2000).

The past research on attribution theory contributes to various areas due to the diverse explanations by different scholars. Weiner’s attribution theory has focused on achievement motivation, understanding of success and failure, and interpersonal process in educational settings (Weiner, 1974; Weiner, 1986). Weiner’s study has found that the result or achievement patterns in a task are essential: high skill is attributed to initial performance, low skill to initial
failure. The high achievement person viewed his performance because of his own ability, as it is a reliable causal identification, heightens his subjective hope that he will excel again in the future; so, he proceeds to invest effort. On the other hand, low-achievement individuals viewed their loss because of their own lack of ability, a stable aspect that raises their implicit probability that they will lose in the future, and lower their future efforts (Weiner, 1974; Weiner, 1986). Burnkrant (1975) indicated that the principle of attribution theory has a considerable potential for integrating and adding meaning to the substantial body of literature on product perception and social effect; and also, the theory has an influence on consumer buying decisions.

Folkes (1988) described that the attribution theory was applied in numerous fields such as evaluating product satisfaction, product purchase, product catastrophe, and product endorsements to clarify different attribution process. Moreover, Folkes (1988) reviewed attribution research in consumer behavior and mentioned that the attribution research concerned with all aspects of consumer behavior causal inferences, such as how consumers interpreted causal inferences, what types of assumptions/inferences they make, and the consequences of their inferences. Finally, Folkes (1988) concluded the review that the antecedents of attribution theory studies focused on how a product information influences attributions, how discounting influences product likings, and how the self-perception processes influence willingness to participate in marketing research.

Recently, Weiner (2018) and Weiner (2019) realized that attribution theory can be replicable in many aspects of human motivation, emotions, and to evaluate relational attributes at both the individual and organizational levels. Sun et al. (2019) employed the attribution theory to investigate the relational attribution to see the detrimental impacts on followers’ perception of workers-leadership and affective and behavioral responses at the organizational level. The most noteworthy result found that when employees engaged highly in relational attributions for
servant leadership, they expressed more appreciation of relational attributions and, subsequently, more interpersonal organizational citizenship behaviors, and upward voice against individuals than those employees who do not rely on relational attributions. Munyon et al. (2019) explained why some companies suffer from more negative consequences compared to other companies for a recalled product. Munyon et al. (2019) explored the consumers’ response to a recalled product and examined how attributions shape consumer responses to the firms. Their study design contributed to the extent that attribution theory can be valid at the individual and firm levels. The findings showed that when faulty goods were in-sourced, and firms ignored the defect, customers made more significant liability decisions than when defective products were outsourced and when firms were unaware of the defective products until after use.

Furthermore, literature validated that attribution theory has been extensively applied to measure product perceptions in consumer research study (Folkes, 1988; Weiner, 2000). More specifically, the attribution theory has been employed in the fields of corporate social responsibility to evaluate the consumers’ attribution and brand evaluation in the case of a product-harm crisis (Klein & Dawar, 2004); international marketing to reshape the managerial mindsets into retail internationalization (Cort et al., 2007); tag function on popular product evaluation (Bao et al., 2021); product recall (Yakut & Bayraktaroglu, 2021); product repurchase intentions (Yoo & Kim, 2020); product failure (Folkes, 1984); and the tourism industry to observe tourist’s experiences, tourist attributions, and tourist cognition behavior (Jackson, 2019). In this study, this theory can be applied to how multiple attributes such as economic development status and eco-products influence consumers’ perceived consumption values of the product and purchase intentions.
2.1.2. The Theory of Consumption Values

The theoretical framework of the perceived consumption value was developed in 1991 by Sheth, Newman, and Gross. The theory of consumption value has long been used in numerous product perceived or consumption value related studies. According to Sheth et al. (1991), consumer choice behavior can be predicted by asking why they prefer to purchase or not to purchase a particular product, and why they prefer one product brand against another product brand. This theory contains five consumption values: (1) functional value; (2) social value; (3) emotional value; (4) epistemic value; and (5) conditional value. The authors also mentioned that different consumption values are independent variables while consumer choice behavior is the dependent variable. The seminal article developed by Sheth et al. (1991) defined the five different consumption values as following:

1. Emotional value: this value was regarded as the perceived usefulness obtained from an alternative’s ability to boost emotional states. According to emotional value, if the consumers have positive emotions on specific products, they are positively influenced to buy the product.

2. Social value: this value denotes the perceived usefulness derived from one or more specific social groups, and social value groups considered demographic, socioeconomic, and cultural-ethnic groups.

3. Functional value: functional value denotes the perceived usefulness derived from a functional, utilitarian, or physical presentation of a product.

4. Epistemic value: epistemic value relates to the perceived utility gained from an alternative’s ability to encourage inquisitiveness, provide uniqueness and/or fill the
required expertise. As this study will measure the country-of-origin effects of eco/non-eco products, so the study will not include the epistemic value.

5. Conditional value: this value is related to the perceived usefulness obtained in a particular scenario or set of conditions confronting the decision-maker from an option. This value is linked to a particular moment, location, and condition when customers pay attention to the circumstances. Eventually, the conditional value refers to the perceived usefulness derived from an alternative in a specific place or set of circumstances facing the decision-maker. This value is related to the position of a specific time, place, and situation when consumers pay attention to the info about the circumstances. This study will measure the country-of-origin effects of eco/non-eco products, so the study will not consider the conditional value.

Based on the consumption values of Sheth et al. (1991), Sweeney and Soutar (2001) developed a new evaluating scale named as PERVAL, which was used to measure the value of durable goods. This value scale was established for utilization in a retail buying setting to assess what consumption values drive consumers’ buying intentions and behavior. Sweeney and Soutar (2001) modified the consumption value constructs developed by Sheth et al. (1991) by excluding the epistemic values and conditional values and splitting the functional values into two dimensions (i.e., quality and price). Thus, their four different value dimensions were named as emotional, social, quality/performance and price/value for money. These value dimensions were established to explain consumer attitudes and behavior. Based on the conceptual foundation of consumption value developed by Sheth et al. (1991) and Sweeney and Soutar (2001), many other researchers have conceptualized different multidimensional customer value (Lin et al., 2005; Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2006).
Till to date, the theory of consumption value has been widely applied in numerous areas such as customer-relationship management performance (Wang et al. 2004); location-based mobile services (Philström & Brush, 2008); business services (Whittaker et al., 2007); adventure tourism settings (Williams & Soutar, 2009); and the transportation sector to examine the biofuel consumption (Zailani et al., 2019). Furthermore, this theory has been extensively utilized in numerous product categories, such as long-lasting and nondurable consumer goods, engineering goods, and facilities (Sweeney and Souter, 2001).

The theory of consumption value has already been successfully documented in various empirical study areas. However, researchers admit that the critical aspects of the theory are still not addressed, considering the antecedents and consequences of the customer perceived value (Zauner et al., 2015). Moreover, the PERVAL scale developed by Sweeney and Souter (2001) has been modified into different scale items from scholars in diverse study areas, and some additional value has been used to measure the consumption values of a consumer. As a result, the potential research warrants the need to develop a universal item scale and the generalizability of the theory’s operationalization to apply the same scale to all consumer classifications, retail and service sectors. Further, several studies argued that retail environments could differ across countries which may affect customers’ value perception and that perceived consumption values could be implemented in international retailing (Walsh et al., 2014; Zailani et al., 2019). As a result, future researchers may assess factors that influence consumer consumption values in multi-country settings.
2.2. KEY CONSTRUCTS

2.2.1. Economic development status

Variations of economic development status are an important factor underlying the country-of-origin effect on the evaluation of products (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). Country’s economic development status of product design or manufacturing has been widely used in the international business or consumer behavior research. Specifically, Dinnie (2004) used country-of-origin to examine whether product evaluation can measure consumer choice based on economic development status between domestic products and foreign products. The seminal article of the construct was first conceptualized in 1962 by Schooler, who investigated the Central America common market consumers’ attitude towards the products from another member country. Magnusson and Westjohn (2011) stated that country-of-origin is one of the most studied topics in the global purchasing behavior and that around 750 major publications were made on this subject over the past 50 years.

Researchers described economic development status from different views. Economic development status is defined based on gross domestic product (GDP) or gross national income (GNI) per capita of a country and economic development status are an important factor underlying the country-of-origin effect to the evaluation of products. Some researchers used country-of-origin to relate to economic development status. For example, Pharr (2005) explained that country-of-origin is evaluated by a number of culturally driven antecedents moderated by individual and product-based variables. According to Kotler et al. (1993), the country image of product design or manufacturing is the belief deposited by the consumer, ideas in the consumer’s mindset, and the impressions that the consumer has of a place or country. Moreover, the country
image of a product represents the natural and cultural signs, perceived product values, economic and political situations, and industry revolution (Pappu et al., 2007; Zeugner-Roth et al., 2008).

Magnusson and Westjohn (2011) conceptualized country-of-origin having three distinct constructs (country image, country-of-origin image, and product evaluations/behavior), based on the complex version of the conceptual framework developed by Pharr (2005). Chen and Su (2012) argued that due to the explosion of hybrid products in the international market, the global country-of-origin is partitioned into country-of-design tagged as “design by ____” and country-of-manufacture tagged as “made in ____”.

The identification of brand origin by customers was focused on brand names connections with languages that indicate country origins (Samiee et al., 2005). Furthermore, Samiee et al. (2005) revealed that variables such as socioeconomic status (i.e., education and income), previous international travel, foreign language skills, and gender (men) predict the skills of American consumers in identifying foreign brand origins. Balabanis and Diamantopoulos (2008) examined factors that influence the extent to which consumers can identify the correct country-of-origin (COO) of 13 different brands within a specific product category (i.e., microwave ovens). The authors found that the important antecedents of correct country-of-origin identification are consumer ethnocentrism and socio-demographics (e.g., older consumers and female consumers). However, such antecedents were not observed for all brands with different country-of-origin.

According to Magnusson and Westjohn (2011), the recognition toward the achievement of a product in the overseas market is extremely influenced by consumers’ perception of country-of-origin of the product. Their study revealed that consumers’ purchase decision is driven by the cognitive process, consisting of a collection of product cues (i.e., extrinsic and intrinsic cues) and
those consumers rely on these cues to make purchasing decisions. The authors emphasized that the extrinsic cues, such as country-of-origin, could provide cognitive motivation when intrinsic cues cannot. Papadopoulos and Heslop (2002) mentioned that the country image of a product evaluation also consists of cognitive, affective, and conative dimensions. Later, Roth and Diamantopoulos (2009) operationalized and defined the constructs as having three components: (1) a cognitive component, which includes consumers' beliefs about a particular country, (2) an affective component that describes the country's emotional value to the consumer, and (3) a conative component, capturing consumers' behavioral intentions with regard to the sourcing country. In Suh and Smith’s (2008) study, the country-of-origin image of product design or manufacture is significantly affected by globalization. For example, several studies revealed that consumers in emerging countries preferred products made in western or developed countries, assuming that their quality is better than that of local products (Dao & Heidt, 2018; Lee & Nguyen, 2017; Rodrigo et al. 2019).

Lala et al. (2008) identified seven dimensions of country-of-origin based on marketing and non-marketing literature and the dimensions were (1) economic conditions, (2) conflict, (3) political structure, (4) vocational training, (5) work culture, (6) environment, and (7) labor. The authors mentioned that as all the participants were from the United States, there is a weakness in using the standardized country-of-origin scale for different countries because previous studies found different reliabilities in different countries (Lala et al. 2008). Moreover, the result of economic development status till date have been unresolved (Jin et al. 2015). However, the general inferences show that a product’s economic development status of the country can influence consumers’ evaluation process of a product and can be used for product evaluations.
2.2.2. Eco-products

The term eco-product, eco-fashion, green fashion, green consumption, or ethical fashion has become a buzzword in the fashion industry. This eco word is considered as one of integral components of the sustainable fashion industry. Sometimes, eco-product or eco-fashion was looked at as the synonym of sustainable fashion (Khandual & Pradhan, 2018; Tan, 2019). The seminal research work introducing environmental considerations was reported by the author Victor Papanek in 1985 in his book ‘Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change’. Papanek gave a comprehensive overview of the design industry, highlighting its position in promoting consumption, thus adding environmental and social degradation. The author represented a sophisticated reflection concentrating not only on enhancing design activity yields but also on supporting the green attitudes in the design profession. However, the subsequent early implementation of 'green' attitudes in the design industry did not show a significant transformational change (Ceschin & Gaziulusoy, 2016).

Broadly, eco-products were defined as products that do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings (Tan, 2019). The first initiative of eco-fashion was taken by the brand Patagonia and Esprit in the early 1990s, using organic cotton to the materials in the e-collection of the product line (Tan, 2019). Díaz-García et al. (2015) mentioned that eco-products have been used in the literature to reduce the negative impact on the environment as “green”, “eco”, “environmental” and “sustainable”.

Prieto-Sandoval et al. (2016) defined the eco-labeling as an eco-innovation tool that could contribute to the sustainable design, production and consumption products and also, could be characterized as a mechanism of interaction between customers, companies, regulators, and organizations. Eco-innovation can be different from eco because this is an environmental
management tool that can inform consumers of products’ new green features (i.e., eco-labels) in a visual way. Moreover, it can fulfill the environmental needs of consumers; companies can generate value for society; promote sustainability; and governments and organizations can increase sustainable production and consumption. The ultimate goal of eco-innovation is to add to the growth of sustainable and environmentally friendly forms of manufacturing and consumption that are clearly presented on products and facilities that meet consumers’ environmental expectations.

Xavier et al. (2017) specified that six major research areas could be highlighted for the application of eco-innovation: (1) product design and innovation; (2) environmental management, strategy and policy; (3) innovation process, management and strategy; (4) business strategy and organizational management; (5) supply chain management and sustainability; and (6) industrial ecology and ecological economics. Furthermore, Díaz-García et al. (2015) revealed that environmental innovation could be applied at the macro-level (policy instruments linked to the specific eco-innovations, industrial-sectorial, and technological innovation systems), meso-level (role of market dynamics, pressure groups), and micro-level (values of owner/manager, firms’ performance, firms’ reputation). Tudor et al. (2007) acknowledged that the review of eco or sustainability could be applied within a business setting to secure more economic and social benefits.

Khandual and Pradhan (2019) mentioned that consumers are increasingly concerned with environmental issues and whether their products are ethically produced, pointing the fashion industry’s need to change the business model for sustainability. In this vein, Tan (2019) specified the impact of the eco-product or eco-fashion from the perspectives of consumers, social, environment, and business. The study acknowledged the perspective of consumers who
considered eco-product or eco-fashion as consuming an environmentally friendly product produced with less hazardous chemicals, which leads to less wasteful consumption, has better quality, and long-lasting. From the social perspective, eco-product or eco-fashion creates fair working conditions for the workers, fair wages, ensures good health of the workers, and is free of child labor and social well-being. From the perspective of the environment, eco-product or eco-fashion helps to produce less production waste and ensure cleaned process for slower cycle for the business. Finally, from a business’ perspective, eco products consume fewer materials, involve sustainable production, and lead to the business’ long-term sustainability (Tan, 2019).

Cervellon and Carey (2011) claimed that consuming an eco-product or eco-fashion is not directly related to a safe environment; instead, it is related to the consumer’s egoistical attitude, health concern, and guilty feeling from unfriendly environmental behavior. Moreover, this study argued that customers had specific motivations for the wearing of eco-fashion products. For example, North American consumers were motivated by self-expression, and European consumers were motivated by status display. Several European consumers perceived conspicuous consumption as a new form of purchasing green products.

2.2.3. Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is widely used in assessing consumer attitudes toward domestic versus foreign products. Brown (2007) cited Sunmer’s (1906) article for developing the general concept of ethnocentrism and defined it as believing that the norms, values, ideology, customs, and traditions of one’s own culture are superior to all other cultural settings. The concept of ethnocentrism was designed to capture one’s cognitions, and emotions related to product offers by other countries (Shimp, 1984). According to Shrimp (1984), consumer ethnocentrism was
explained to capture the normative-based beliefs of a consumer that buying foreign products is harmful to the country’s economy, the country, and the citizens and on the other hand, buying domestic products is good for the country. Numerous studies found that ethnocentric consumers are persuaded to prefer domestic products over products produced overseas (Josiassen et al., 2011; Netemeyer et al., 1991; Verlegh, 2007; Winit et al., 2014). These studies ascertain that consumer have a positive approach toward locally made products against foreign made products. Brodowsky (1998) also found that with a high level of ethnocentrism, consumers showed positive philosophies and attitudes toward buying locally designed and assembled products. Siamagka and Balabanis (2015) argued that ethnocentrism factors were not only related to consumers’ cognitive approaches, such as perceptions of domestic product superiority or foreign product inferiority, but also, they were related to different perspectives of product characteristics and environmental concerns.

On the other hand, Pecotic and Rosenthal (2001) revealed that ethnocentrism had no direct effect on product quality and country-of-origin dimensions (a domestic well-known high-quality producer and an unknown poor quality producer country). However, it directly affects consumers’ views regarding product price perceptions that indicate how much the consumers want to pay and the degree of certainty regarding purchase intentions. This result is somewhat consistent with the study of Acharya and Elliott (2003), who displayed strong support for the positive relationship between ethnocentrism and the quality of products produced and assembled in the domestic market. However, they found a weak relationship between ethnocentrism and the quality of products made and designed in the local market. Oyserman et al. (2002) revealed that the consumers in developed Western countries were more individualistic than the consumers in developing countries. Therefore, one would believe that consumers in advanced countries might
display low levels of ethnocentrism and a high level of individualism and cosmopolitanism. Cleveland et al. (2009) found that wealthier consumers showed less ethnocentrism. Siamagka and Balabanis (2015) showed that the cost of living, availability of domestic/local products were considered as country factors, while word-of-mouth and negative publicity were assumed as environmental factors that could shape the model of ethnocentrism to explain the consumers’ attitude towards the domestic and foreign products.

2.2.4. Knowledge of Eco-products

In the fashion industry, retailers’ sustainability initiatives related to social and environmental activities significantly impact business success and create a positive image for the consumer. Besides, knowledge of any right or harmful activities quickly impacts a person’s behavioral intentions. Shim (1995) argued that consumers’ general eco-product attitude and waste recycling consumption or disposal pattern was significantly influenced by the knowledge about the product and its impact on the environment. According to Dickson (2005), more consumers read and achieve knowledge about the moral scopes of the environment-friendly products, enhancing the probability of purchasing those products. Dickson (2005) also argued that those who purchase environmentally friendly products are more ethical than their counterparts.

Researchers asserted that distributors’ sustainability projects in the fashion industry had a positive effect on company achievement and created a clear picture for the customer. Yang et al. (2017) revealed that sustainable initiatives show a positive influence on social and environmental aspects and that knowledge of the sustainable supply chain influences consumers’ positive behavioral intentions. Relatedly, knowledge of environmental issues is strongly correlated with
the customers’ positive attitude toward the eco-brand and increases purchasing intentions. However, knowledge of social issues was found insignificant in its relationship to consumers’ sustainable consumptions (Okur & Saricam, 2019). Buzzo and Abreu (2019) discussed the relationship between the excessive consumption of fast fashion and sustainability issues. They argued that the awareness of excessive consumption of fast fashion products gives a new way of consuming fashion products which cause less impacts both environmentally and socially (Buzzo & Abreu, 2019).

2.2.5. Consumption Value

Consumption value has been widely used in the marketing, management, and consumer behavior studies. Zeithaml (1988) defined perceived consumption value as the consumer’s complete evaluation of the usefulness of a product or service based on the perception of an experienced and existing presentation of product or service. Sheth, Newman, and Gross (1991) developed the theoretical framework of the multidimensional perceived consumption value. In their study, Sheth et al. (1991) asked why consumers prefer to purchase or not to purchase a particular product and why they prefer one product brand against another product brand. This theory contains five consumption values: (1) functional value; (2) social value; (3) emotional value; (4) epistemic value; and (5) conditional value.

Emotional value was defined as the perceived usefulness obtained from an alternative's ability to boost emotional states. Social value was denoted as the perceived usefulness derived from one or more specific social groups and social value groups. Functional value was denoted as the perceived usefulness derived from a functional, utilitarian, or physical presence of a product. The epistemic value was represented as the perceived utility gained from an alternative's
ability to encourage inquisitiveness, provide uniqueness, and fill the required expertise.

Conditional value was related to the perceived usefulness obtained in a particular scenario or set of conditions confronting the decision-maker from an option (Sheth et al., 1991).

Sheth et al. (1991) also claimed that different consumption values could be used as independent variables, and consumer choice behavior could be used as the dependent variable. Consumption value also has been widely related to consumers’ attitudes and behavior. Sheth et al. (1991) stated that emotional value influences consumers’ trust and faith in buying a product. Finch’s (2006) and Lin and Huang’s (2012) studies revealed that emotional value influences the respondents in buying recycled and green products because it helps to preserve the environment. Sheth et al. (1991) argued that social value is related to endorsement and self-esteem. Awuni and Du (2016) discovered that social value, along with emotional value strongly influenced young adults in their purchasing intentions.

On the other hand, functional value was considered a principal driver of customer choice behavior. It could result from the features or qualities, such as consistency, resilience, and value of a product (Sheth et al., 1991; Sweeney & Souter, 2001). Gonçalves et al. (2016) claimed that functional value is not enough to buy green products, while the absence of functional value is sufficient to influence consumers not to buy green products.

Lai (1991) specified that when a consumer interacts with a fresh product to make a purchasing decision, the consumer evaluates the product based on the combination of new product data and known information of the old product. Accordingly, Laroche et al. (2001) found that consumer knowledge or information about a product plays a significant role in determining new product adoption. Wang et al. (2013) discovered that the conditional values arise when the study contexts are strongly linked to the product and services in a specific context. The above
statements point out that the five consumption value dimensions contribute differently to many fields of research.

2.3. CONCEPTUAL MODEL DEVELOPMENT

The proposed model of this study begins with the link between dependent variables (i.e., perceived consumption values) and independent variables (i.e., Economic development status and eco-products [eco or non-eco]) and two moderators (i.e., ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-product) between these two variable sets. The purposed model of the study examines whether the economic development status (a domestic developed country vs. a foreign developing country) and an eco-product (eco- vs. non-eco product) leads to different consumption values.

This study also evaluates the moderating effects of ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-product between the paths of independent variables, economic development status and eco/non-eco products, respectively and dependent variable (i.e., consumption values). Finally, the study evaluates how the consumers’ different consumption values influence purchase intentions. The developed proposed in the study are presented in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Proposed model
2.4. HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

2.4.1. The effect of economic development status on consumption values

Magnusson and Westjohn (2011) argued that country’s economic development status is one of the essential cues used in evaluating product choice imported from different manufacturing markets. It is the most researched issue in international buyer behavior. However, the country-of-origin research has provided a wide spectrum of results associated with price, quality, emotional value, social value, functional value, cultural value, and knowledge about the country. Sharma (2011) also claimed that country-of-origin effects on consumers in emerging markets are inconclusive.

Some studies showed a clear preference for foreign goods, whereas others showed differences in country-of-origin effects on product attributes perceptions. Wang and Yang (2008) conducted a study to analyze the relationship between country-of-origin image, brand personality, and purchase intentions. The study result showed that product country-of-origin image and brand personality exhibited significant main positive effects on purchase intentions. Moreover, the results revealed the moderating effect of economic development status of the country in the relationship between brand personality and purchase intention, specifically, a positive country’s economic development status image enhanced brand personality’s positive effect on purchase intention and vice-versa. Delong et al. (2004) revealed that US brands sold in the Chinese market were evaluated more positively in product attributes than Chinese brands among Chinese shoppers except for fit and price satisfaction. Similarly, Wang et al. (2004) discovered that Chinese consumers who prefer to buy imported branded apparel tend to have a unique way of living and shopping that is different from the way they shop for domestic clothes. In another study, Hu et al. (2008) explored Chinese consumers’ wine purchasing behavior. They
revealed that Chinese customers in a public environment give more importance to economic development status of the country than to other variables (i.e., price and brand name) and more likely to purchase foreign wines instead of domestic wines. Micevski et al. (2019) expressed that European Union (EU) is such an identity in where consumers become affiliated to multiple sociocultural entities and argued that such identities have a unique crossover function that drives preferences for both domestic and foreign products. Moreover, the study demonstrated that the effect of European Union (EU) identity on product preferences was qualified by the level of ethnocentrism; that is, the EU identity has a significant impact on the preference of domestic products only in the absence of high ethnocentrism. Guo and Zhou (2017) conducted a meta-analysis and demonstrated that the effects of consumer ethnocentrism on domestic versus foreign product decision and on willingness to purchase domestic versus foreign products moderated by economic development status (developed market vs. developing market), cultural context (eastern culture vs. western culture) and sample types (general consumers vs. student consumers). Besides, Cheah et al. (2016) revealed that intense hostility against the Japanese culminated in Chinese consumers’ refusal to buy Japanese goods. However, De Nisco et al. (2016) showed that the perceived level of economic hostility does not affect the general country image and product beliefs, but is adversely related to the product receptivity (product receptivity defined as the conscious or unconscious readiness to accept foreign supply systems). This research also supported the correlation between economic hostility and consumer ethnocentrism; consumers who are angry at a foreign country will prefer national products and avoid foreign products. Finally, Mueller et al. (2016) mentioned that Chinese new emerging wealthy classes, younger consumers, and the local elite consumers are more likely to show xenocentrism or favoring the foreignness of a product. Therefore, it is not clear from above discussion, whether
economic development status effects are the same for consumers in developed and emerging markets.

Maheswaran and Chen (2006) revealed that favorable and unfavorable assessments of a country linked to a product have led to favorable or unfavorable product assessments. Similarly, Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) argued that country-of-origin not only was an important quality cue in explaining product judgment or evaluation but also the cognitive, affective, normative aspects, and economic development were some other important factors underlying the country-of-origin effects. For example, sensory, affective, and ritual connotations may be derived from a product from a developed product-country. Specifically, Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) mentioned that normative aspects of country of origin relate to “customer voting”, a particularly salient norm by deciding to buy or avoid a country’s product, which is consumers "vote" for or against the policies and practices of a country's government.

Laroche et al. (2005) mentioned that the product country image is the three-dimensional concept consisting of: (a) a cognitive component which incorporates the consumer's convictions about the industrial development and technological progress of the country; (b) the affective component describing the affective response of consumers to the people of the country; and (c) a conative element consisting of the level of consumer relationship with the sourcing country. This study results also demonstrated that when the affective component of a country image is higher than the cognitive component, the effect of country image on product evaluation exhibited more power than its influence on product beliefs. On the other hand, when the cognitive component of a country image is higher than the affective components, the influence of country image on product evaluation showed less power than its influence on product beliefs. All information
above indicates that economic development status of a country has a strong correlation with the consumers’ cognitive, affective, and conative components leading to influence product choice.

Dinnie (2004) highlighted that the product cues such as price and quality may have stronger effect on consumers’ product evaluations than the country-of-origin cue. However, “buy domestic” campaigns may become successful because they highlight the country-of-origin of a domestically produced product. Kumar et al. (2009) investigated the Indian consumers’ purchase intention toward a US retail brand versus a local Indian brand. They found that the perceived quality and emotional value positively influenced consumers’ perception toward the US brand. Cordell (1992) showed that product preference was found more in a developed country compared to a less developed country in terms of product quality and choice measures. Another study revealed that Indian consumers’ preferred foreign product brands with a high technology compared to a low technology in the Indian market with better quality at lower prices, but with a high level of emotional states this result showed a positive bias toward local brands (Kinra, 2006). In contrast, Indian consumers showed negative attitudes toward local brands because they consider the local brand has low quality compared to the US brand and the US brand had emotional value which was generated from the feeling or affective states (i.e., enjoyment or pleasure) of the product (Kumar et al., 2009). Similarly, Shi et al. (2016) investigated adolescent Chinese consumers’ purchase intentions for local brands considering the effects of perceived social status value and materialistic values. The findings showed that social status value is an important antecedent of Chinese adolescent consumers’ purchase intention for a local brand compared to a foreign brand. Moreover, the authors found that materialistic values showed a significant positive moderating effect on Chinese materialistic consumers compared to non-
materialistic consumers were more likely to purchase local brands with a high levels of social status value (Shi et al., 2016).

However, several studies on the effect of economic development status on product evaluation revealed that consumers preferred products made in a developed country compared to a developing country. Some studies revealed that even the consumers in some developing countries preferred products made in a developed country because they are associated with higher product quality, latest fashion, attractiveness, more prestigious compared to local products. For instance, Lee and Nguyen (2017) found that Vietnamese consumers perceived functional attributes as the most important attributes for choosing an American fashion brand over a locally made fashion product. They also indicated that American brands compared to local brands are attractive, higher quality, and more prestigious, while only the price is the benefit of buying local fashion brands. In a study of Dao and Heidt (2018), consumers in Vietnam (a developing country) prefer brands such as Sony and Honda made in Japan (a developed country) over domestic brands because of positive market-based brand value, the consumer-based image of the country and business trust in Japanese goods. Further, Rodrigo et al. (2019) revealed that Sri Lankan elite consumers’ attitude toward products made in a foreign country (e.g., USA, Germany, Japan, Korea, and Thailand) is more favorable than a locally made product because of subjective norms (perceived social pressure on consumers’ decision making) and self-image congruence. Self-image congruence was defined as the cognitive match between a product’s image and consumers’ actual self-image, ideal self-image, social-self-image, and ideal-social self-image. The authors revealed a significant positive relationship among subjective norms, self-image congruence, and purchase intentions towards the products made in foreign countries (e.g., USA, Germany, Japan, Korea, and Thailand) compared to locally produced products. The result
findings revealed that self-image congruence is a stronger predictor of products made in foreign countries (e.g., USA, Germany, Japan, Korea, and Thailand) than products made locally. Moreover, the result revealed that consumers’ attitudes toward foreign countries partially positively mediate the relationship between self-image congruence and purchase intentions towards products made in foreign countries.

Lee and Yi (2019) analyzed the effect of outdoor brand (used for outdoor activities e.g., hiking, running, walking etc.) on consumer's consumption value (i.e., functional value, conditional value, and emotional value) and the effect of company's creating shared values (i.e., economic value, relational value, and social value) activity on consumers' purchase intention. The results showed that functional value, conditional value, and emotional value of consumption value were found to have a significant positive effect on purchase intention, and economic value, social value, and relational value of company's creating shared values were also influenced respectively positively the purchase intention. Moreover, Park and Ku (2008) analyzed the relationship between consumption value typology and fashion product purchasing behavior of college students. This study classified consumption value typologies into three groups: (1) Social Value oriented, (2) Functional Value oriented, and (3) Differentiated Individuality oriented group. The result showed that social value-oriented consumption value group and differentiated individually oriented group consumers were more conscious of clothing product searching propensities behavior compared to functional value-oriented consumption value group.

Put all these arguments above, it is expected that products made in domestic developed countries will produce positive consumers’ perceptions toward the emotional, social, and functional consumption values compared to products made in foreign developing countries. Therefore, the study proposes the following hypothesis:
**Hypothesis 1:** A product made in a domestic developed country will elicit more positive 
(a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a product made in a 
foreign developing country.

2.4.2. The effect of eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) on consumption values

The word “eco” is one of integral parts of sustainable product consumption and has been 
used in the contexts of eco-fashion, green fashion, green consumption in sustainable 
consumption (Khandual & Pradhan, 2018). Cervellon and Carey (2011) claimed that consuming 
an eco-product or eco-fashion is not directly interrelated to a safe environment; rather it is related 
to consumers’ egoistical attitude (e.g., protecting their own body by purchasing green beauty 
products) and guilty feeling from doing unfriendly environmental behavior. Also, Biswas and 
Roy (2015) indicated that the pattern of decreased natural resource consumption, changing 
lifestyles, and consuming environmentally friendly products reflect sustainable consumption that 
addresses current needs and aspirations for future generations.

Researchers addressed that eco-product or sustainable product consumption is prone to 
change based on product value, product price, personal value, environmental value, social 
context, and product availability. For instance, Issacs (2015) examined whether the price and 
quality factors affect eco-products choice behavior and whether consumers were willing to pay 
more to buy eco-friendly products. The study concluded that the quality and the price of eco-
products positively influenced consumers to consume an eco-product and willingly pay more for 
it. Moreover, Lundblad and Davies (2016) stated that consumers perceived sustainable clothing, 
compared to an average street clothing, having a higher price and higher quality that outweighs 
paying extra money. The authors also indicated that higher quality is strongly related to durable, 
long-lasting products, and buying less in the long run, which influences consumers to perceive
more positively about the product’s value for money. On the other hand, Biswas and Roy (2015) found that consumers in India, a large emerging economy country in South East Asia, express that the price sensitivity is high, whether consumers buy green products or non-green products. Relatedly, Lin and Huang (2012) determined factors that influence Taiwanese consumers’ purchasing behavior regarding green products. The study results indicated that consumers with higher green concern on products demonstrated higher functional value than the consumers with lower green concern. All this evidence suggests that purchasing eco-product positively is related to functional consumption value.

Eco-product consumption has been related to emotional consumption value. Lundblad and Davies (2016) revealed that sustainable fashion consumption is driven by values closely related to the consumers’ self-expression and self-esteem, which motivates consumers to purchase sustainable fashion possessing attributes like unique styles and materials expressing individuality (exclusiveness) and obtaining comfort. Consumers are now more concerned with the environmental issues and ethical production of their products. Tan (2019) mentioned that eco-products or eco-fashion products produce less hazardous chemicals in their production chain, less wasteful consumption, which elicits the consumer’s positive likeness or affective states about the eco-product. Moreover, Lundblad and Davies (2016) acknowledged that consuming sustainable clothing produces guilt-free integrity and a good feeling about the sustainability of workers' rights and welfare. Similarly, Lin and Huang (2012) emphasized that consumers who act as going green have positive feelings of doing good for themselves and for the society at large and identify themselves as environmental defenders, which leads to high emotional value about the product. Similarly, Bly et al. (2015) declared sustainable fashion as a source of pleasure and well-being. Park and Ha (2012) also revealed that purchasers of green products
showed a higher level of affective attitude compared to non-purchasers of green products. Put simply, these findings suggest that purchasing eco-products positively relates to emotional consumption value compared to purchasing non-eco-products.

Biswas and Roy (2015) revealed that social value parameters were dominant factors influencing sustainable consumption behavior, especially products with green credentials. Salazar et al. (2013) argued that social groups such as colleagues, family, and friends could influence consumers to choose environmentally friendly products rather than conventional ones. Moreover, Biswas and Roy (2015) revealed that social value is more dominant in influencing sustainable consumption behavior adoption than other green preferential factors (i.e., knowledge value, environmental value, conditional value, and functional value). Similarly, Lin and Huang (2012) found that consumers with higher green concerns about a product demonstrate higher social value than consumers with lower green concerns about a product. Some other research results implied the same notion that consumers were positively influenced by social context (Ritter et al., 2015) and opinion leaders in consuming eco-products (Yoo et al. 2018). Also, consumers positively evaluated a company when the company shares consumers’ social causes (Choi & Ng, 2011). Suki and Suki (2015) examined the impact of consumption values (i.e. functional value, social value, emotional value, conditional value and epistemic value) on consumer environmental concern about green products in Malaysia. The results revealed that social value had the most significant effect on consumer environmental concerns regarding green products. Awuni and Du (2016) analyzed the sustainable consumptions in Chinese cities supermarkets, found that emotional and social values are positively related to young adults’ green purchasing intentions. Therefore, it can be argued that eco-products positively lead to consumers’ social consumption value compared to non-eco-products.
Given all these arguments above, the study proposes the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 2:** An eco-product will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a non-eco-product.

### 2.4.3. The effects of economic development status and eco-products on consumption values

Research has been shown the congruity or matching between economic development status, product quality, and price in many empirical studies. However, no direct study showed the relationship between the economic development status and eco/non-eco products on consumers’ product consumption behaviors. Moreover, research has shown that sustainability and country-of-origin independently positively affects consumers’ product choice behavior (Biswas & Roy, 2015; Lin & Huang, 2012; Wang & Yang, 2008).

Researchers investigated these two important product cues (i.e., economic development status of a country and eco-products) in consumer choice behavior. Park et al. (2012) conducted a study to compare US consumers’ psychological aspects of pro-environmental behaviors between green product purchasers and green product non-purchasers. They found that green product purchasers demonstrated higher levels of cognitive attitude, affective attitude, social norm, personal norm, and recycling intention than non-purchasers of a green product. Similarly, Ritter et al. (2015) investigated Brazilian consumers’ attitude towards green product consumption motivation. They found that information and knowledge on green products, environmental attitudes (e.g., reading reports about environmental problems), social contexts such as social values, altruism, cultural aspects and citizenship, and environmental consciousness (e.g., trying to reduce the wastes nor no longer buy from a company that harms the environment) were positively related to green consumption. In contrast, the product price and product quality exhibited a significant, but weaker relationship with green consumption.
Furthermore, Kumar and Ghodeswar (2015) discovered that several factors such as environmental protection, the realization of environmental responsibilities, green product experience, environmental friendliness of companies, and social appeal affected green product purchase decisions. Also, Buerke et al. (2017) showed that responsible sustainable consumers’ consumption was comprised of both societal and individual dimensions. Specifically, consumers’ societal responsibilities (doing well) and consumers' personal well-being (doing well) had positive influences on responsible consumption behavior.

Shen, Richards, and Liu (2013) identified dimensions of the sustainable fashion construct among the students at a large state university in the United States. The result findings demonstrated that consumers’ sustainability awareness varied across the four factors (i.e., recycle/vintage, fair trade/locally made, artisan/custom, and organic/vegan). Most of the consumers were aware of recycle/vintage, followed by fair trade/locally made. They suggested that combining fair trade and locally made features might be more effective in promoting the products in the fashion industry.

Joergens (2006) analyzed the effect of ethical issues on consumers’ fashion consumption behavior in the UK and Germany. The findings show that ethical concerns impact the behavior of consumers in buying modes. The majority of consumers were more interested in their fashion needs when it came to fashion purchases than the rest of the supply chain requirements. This finding may be explained by the fact that consumers do not have enough choices because large quantities of garments available in the market were produced in developing countries. The authors also argued that the “made in” sign was not a meaningful indicator of ethical purchasing behavior.
Veit et al. (2018) examined whether the country-of-origin and sourcing strategies affect customers' sustainability perception. The study included country-of-origin in the customer-company relationship and examined whether customer perceptions change when a sustainability scandal is brought about. Customer views of sustainability in businesses have shown to have a positive effect on buying behavior. Findings showed that perceptions are influenced by psychic distance (country combination: the lowest psychic distance was represented by Japan & Germany and Spain & Germany; the highest psychic distance was represented by Japan & Indonesia and Spain & Indonesia). The perceived sustainability of the focal company's country-of-origin and its suppliers seemed to influence its customer perceptions. While customers tended to perceive low psychic distance countries as more sustainable, they also expected them to act more sustainably and showed greater interest in local initiatives.

Henninger et al. (2016) argued that “locally made” aspects raised concerns in the UK fashion market because they source materials within the EU and manufacture in the UK, which attempt to reduce the carbon footprint for production to a minimum. The local sourcing and production are viewed as sustainable by consumers due to consistency throughout the supply chain, traceability of manufacturing practices and raw materials, sustainable raw materials, and social aspect (i.e., safe working and equal wages).

Hempel and Hamm (2016) investigated whether the product perceptions and determinants of organic and local food products were complements to each other. They found that the organic-minded consumers were like to choose the combination of local and organic food production rather than an organic product from a neighboring country. Ferreira and Ribeiro (2017) found that consumers were willing to pay more and increase purchase intentions when the product manufacturing companies were socially responsible for the national brand compared to
foreign brands. This result indicates that the product’s country-of-origin (national vs. foreign) interacts with the corporate social responsibility to enhance the consumers’ willingness to pay more and purchase intentions. In an aquaculture study, Banovic et al. (2019) investigated the impact of health and nutrition claims, country-of-origin and eco-label on consumer choice of new aquaculture products in a cross-cultural context and found that country-of-origin label “produced in own country” together with eco-label functioned better than the health and nutrition claims as a driver of choice.

No study has directly addressed economic development status and eco-product interactional effects on different consumers’ consumption values. Moreover, the result of economic development status till date have been unresolved (Jin et al. 2015). Taken all together from the above, it is expected that the two factors – eco/non-eco products and economic development status – will interact in generating consumers’ consumption values. Specifically, the factor eco-product produced in a domestic country can provoke consumers’ consumption about the product compared to a non-eco-product made in a foreign developing country and there should be no significant effect of non-eco-product produced in domestic country and eco-product made in foreign developing country. Therefore, the interaction effect of manufacturing economic development status and sustainable eco/non-eco product on consumers’ consumption values is hypothesized as follows:

**Hypothesis 3:** An eco-product produced in the domestic developed country will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a non-eco-product produced in a foreign developing country. On the other hand, there is no difference in these three consumption values between non-eco-products made in a domestic developed country and eco-products made in a foreign developing country.
2.4.4. The moderating effect of ethnocentrism between economic development status and consumption values

Numerous studies profiled that ethnocentric consumer prefer domestic products over the overseas market produced products. The empirical findings of numerous studies showed that consumers’ tendencies for ethnocentrism were directly influenced by different factors such as product characteristics, consumer characteristics, and self-enhancement. Winit et al. (2014) stated that product characteristics (i.e., the effect of price) and ethnocentrism varied considerably across different product categories such as utilitarian (fruit juice and airline) and hedonic (jeans and coffee shop). Moreover, Winit et al. (2014) found that consumers showed higher tolerance for higher priced products when the ethnocentrism is high and on the other hand, low-ethnocentrism consumers’ lower tolerance forced them to buy foreign global brand products. Similarly, Josiassen et al. (2011) argued that customer characteristics (i.e., especially age and gender) found to be an important moderator of the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy. They revealed that female and older consumers’ ethnocentric tendencies were more prevalent than man and younger consumers (Josiassen et al., 2011). At the same, customers’ self-enhancement influenced stronger for consumers who identify more strongly with their own country, and complementary to the effect of consumer ethnocentrism (Verlegh, 2007). Maheswaran and Chen (2006) investigated the effect of incidental emotions such as anger, sadness, and frustration, and cognitive appraisal on economic development status effects on product evaluations. The result revealed that positiveness of the economic development status information influenced more of angry consumers compared to sad consumers (Maheswaran & Chen, 2006). Siamagka and Balabanis (2015) mentioned that consumer ethnocentrism is a multi-dimensional building that covers five dimensions: prosociality that refers to caring, empathy, and
benefits for others; cognitions that refers to the consumer perceptions of domestic product superiority or foreign product inferiority; insecurity (a threat to protect the domestic economy by supporting domestic products.); reflexiveness that refers to preconscious, “waiting-to-be-activated,”; and habituation that refers to as “a habit of mind,” that ethnocentric feelings developed at an early age are automatically activated and shape value judgments and attitudes. In addition, Siamagka and Balabanis (2015) revealed that this new extended multidimensional model of consumer ethnocentrism could explain consumers’ attitude towards domestic and foreign products in together with additional factors, such as country factors (e.g., the cost of living, availability of domestic/local products) or other factors (e.g., word of mouth and negative publicity). Erdogan and Uzkurt (2010) surveyed Turkey consumers to determine the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and product attitudes. The results showed that high ethnocentric consumers were more likely to be less educated and earn lower income compared to low ethnocentric consumers and perceived local products more favorably than low ethnocentric consumers.

Brodowsky (1998) found that consumers showed positive values and attitudes toward buying locally designed products and assembled when they exhibit a high level of consumer ethnocentrism. In another study, Sharma (2011) mentioned that some empirical studies result showed consumer ethnocentrism has a negative effect of developed-market consumers on the evaluation of products imported from emerging countries, whereas materialism and value consciousness exhibited a more substantial positive influence on evaluating purchasing products that imported from developed countries than those from emerging countries. Pecotic and Rosenthal (2001) revealed that ethnocentrism had no effect on product quality but significantly positively affected consumers’ views regarding the monetary value (i.e., price) and purchase
intentions. This result is slightly consistent with Acharya and Elliott's (2003) study that displayed strong support for the product produced and assembled in the domestic market but showed a significant but weak relationship between the product qualities made and designed local market and consumers’ ethnocentrism behavior. On the contrary, Polish consumers’ ethnocentrism displayed more positive perceptions of the domestic products, with little or no effect on perceptions of foreign products even when they knew that the foreign brands were superior in quality to domestic ones (Supphellen & Rittenburg, 2001).

Nowadays, consumers tend to be more globalized, and the effects of ethnocentrism on consumer perceptions differ when cosmopolitanism or xenocentrism are incorporated in consumer studies. Oyserman et al. (2002) revealed that consumers’ individualistic-collectivistic were more predominant on self-concept, well-being, cognition, and relationality in developed western countries than in developing countries and the authors summarized that Americans were found to be more individualistic and less collectivistic than any others. Therefore, one would believe that consumers in advanced countries might display low ethnocentrism levels and high individualism and cosmopolitanism levels. Cleveland et al. (2009) found that wealthier consumers showed less ethnocentrism because they can purchase foreign and status-enhancing products. Similarly, Han (2017) investigated how consumers’ cosmopolitanism and consumer ethnocentrism of an emerging country (China) and an advanced emerging country (Korea) influence their product evaluations of Japanese products. The findings revealed that consumers in the emerging country showed more cosmopolitanism on product evaluations than consumers in the advanced emerging country and consumer cosmopolitanism have greater effects on brand evaluation in an emerging country. However, consumer ethnocentrism for both emerging and advanced emerging countries in brand evaluations of a developed country’s (Japanese company)
product showed an unexpected role because this could not influence the evaluations of products from emerging and advanced emerging countries as one might expect, and the mean value of ethnocentrism was not as high as expected for both countries. This study suggested that consumers in emerging countries may have a reduced ethnocentrism effect as they were experiencing more globalization (Han, 2017).

Finally, Guo and Zhou (2017) conducted a meta-analysis on the 60 studies with a total sample size 15,585 to observe the effects of consumer ethnocentrism on product judgment and willingness to buy. The meta-analysis confirmed that the judgment and willingness for domestic products is influenced positively by consumer ethnocentrism while having a negative effect on the assessment of foreign products but not on the readiness to purchase the foreign product. It also showed that economic development (developed market versus developing market), culture (eastern culture versus western cultures) and type of sampling (general consumers versus students) moderate the effects of consumer ethnocentrism on domestic versus foreign product judgment and on willingness to purchase domestic versus foreign products.

With all these above reviews, it is assumed that consumers’ high ethnocentric behavior positively moderates the relationship between the country’s economic development status and consumers’ consumption values compared to their low ethnocentric behavior. This present research suggests that consumers’ evaluations of products made locally will be more positive when high ethnocentrism is present than when they are not made locally and that this increase in the positivity of evaluation will be greater for foreign-made products. Moreover, the review above predicts that the increase in the difference in change in the positivity of product consumption value between products made in domestic developed countries and products made in foreign developing countries will be greater if consumers show high ethnocentric
behavior than low ethnocentric behavior. Therefore, the moderating effect of ethnocentrism between the product country’s economic development status and consumers’ consumption values is hypothesized as follows:

**Hypothesis 4:** Consumers’ ethnocentrism moderates the relationship between the product country’s economic development status (a domestic developed country vs. a foreign developing country) and consumption values (emotional, social, and functional) in that high (vs. low) ethnocentric consumers elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values towards the product produced in a domestic developed country compared to a product produced in a foreign developing country.

2.4.5. The moderating effect of eco-product knowledge between eco/non-eco products and consumption values

Hill and Lee (2012) explored customers’ knowledge and feelings about sustainability and environmental issues and has shown that a common ecological understanding of how clothing is manufactured can be an obstacle to sustainable consumption.

Shim (1995) argued that consumers’ general eco-product attitude and waste recycling consumption or disposal behavior of clothing products were significantly influenced by the knowledge about the product and its impact on the environment. Besides, Shim (1995) suggested that consumers need to be educated about the reasons for sustainability to develop sensitivity toward environmentalism rather than just be encouraged to recycle. In line with this study, Dickson (2005) argued that beliefs about apparel manufacturing practices in the United States and foreign countries, perceived knowledge about clothing and working conditions, and concerns about issues affecting apparel industry workers supported socially responsible businesses and clothing consumption behavior. The study result showed that as more consumers read and
achieve more knowledge about the environment-friendly products’ moral scopes, they are more likely to purchase those products.

Shen et al. (2012) argued that consumers' knowledge and support of ethical issues could improve ethical reception and shape their buying behavior. They analyzed how these factors influenced consumers' consumption values and revealed that consumer environmentally friendly modes’ knowledge positively influences their support of environmentally responsible businesses and their willingness to pay for ethical modes.

Kang et al. (2013) claimed that consumer knowledge consists of two dimensions: familiarity and product knowledge. The results based on a large group of young consumers in the US, South Korea, and China indicated that consumers’ product knowledge significantly affects consumers’ attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control towards environmentally sustainable textiles and apparel consumption.

Yang et al. (2017) analyzed the published articles to assess sustainable retailing practices in the fashion industry. They found that the field of advanced knowledge about sustainability in the fashion industry is currently increasing. Moreover, the study revealed that sustainable initiatives positively influence social and environmental aspects and the knowledge of the sustainable supply chain positively influences consumers’ behavioral intentions. Okur and Saricam (2019) demonstrated that knowledge is an important issue that drives consumers to purchase clothes sustainably. In other words, consumers are more likely to buy sustainable apparel products if they are more aware of sustainability. Their study included knowledge of environmental issues and social issues to investigate consumers’ behavior towards sustainable apparel consumption. The results revealed that knowledge of environmental issues strongly correlated with the customers’ attitude toward the eco-product. In contrast, knowledge of social
issues was not found to be related to consumers’ sustainable consumption. Similarly, Buzzo and Abreu (2019) claimed that the concern about the consequences of fast fashion consumption and the knowledge of eco-fashion or eco-product have positive influences on consumers’ attitude toward the consumption of fashion products. This concern provided a new way of consuming and producing fashion products that cause fewer negative impacts on both environment and society.

The above review suggests that consumers’ knowledge of eco-products has a positive effect between the relationship product types and different consumption values or consumers’ perceptions of the products. The review also suggests that consumers’ knowledge of ethical issues could improve ethical buying behavior and lead to more positive feelings towards eco-product evaluations than non-eco-product evaluations. It is also an obvious norm that consumers perceive eco-products when they have high knowledge of eco-products and vice versa. Therefore, the moderating effect of knowledge of eco-products between the eco/non-eco products and consumers’ consumption values is hypothesized as follows:

**Hypothesis 5:** Consumers’ knowledge of eco-products moderates the relationship between eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) and consumption values (emotional, social, and functional) in that consumers with a high level of eco-product knowledge experience more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values towards an eco-product compared to a non-eco-product.

**2.4.6. The effect of consumption values on purchase intentions**

The main aim of any company is to achieve positive consumer responses about their products or services. According to Phau et al. (2015), purchase intention reflects consumer intentions to buy products or services based on product attitudes and emotions. Engel et al.
(1990) implied that purchase intentions reflect consumers’ predicted or planned future behaviors. Purchase intentions are frequently measured to see the forecast for the sales of a company’s existing products and services to evaluate the company’s product demand and performance in the market.

According to Sheth et al. (1991), consumer choice behavior can be predicted by asking why they prefer to purchase or not to purchase a particular product, and why they prefer one product brand against another product brand. Later, Sweeney and Souter (2001) developed the new PERVAL scale that is applied to durable goods in a retail purchase situation to determine what consumption values drive purchase attitude and behavior.

Sweeney and Souter (2001) explained that while functional and social value dominated the decision to use filtered or unfiltered cigarettes, the emotional value was vital to smoking. Different value dimensions may be significant depending on the decision level (e.g., buy/not buy or buy brand A/brand B) and the type of product or service being considered. Among the different values, the functional value was the important value in consumers’ product choice; however, other value dimensions (i.e., emotional and social) were also influential in post purchase situations.

In addition, if the consumers have positive emotions about specific products, they are willing to buy the product. Sheth et al. (1991) stated that emotional value influences consumers’ trust and faith in buying a product. Finch (2006) distinguished the nature of organic food buyers’ consumption values from that of non-organic food buyers and revealed the emotional value positively influenced buying recycled and green products. Similarly, Lin and Huang (2012) study examined the influence factors on consumer choice behavior regarding green products and showed that emotional value influences the respondents in buying recycled and green products,
because it helps not to harm the environment. Thus, these two studies support the conceptualization of consumption values used in the study what motivates consumers to buy or not buy organic food and the purchase of green products. Bei and Simpson (1995) reported that 89.1% of their study's respondents feel that they are preserving the environment when they buy recycled products and those who perceived more purchase value were more likely to buy the product. According to Sweeney and Soutar (2001), the social value reflects approval and self-image improvement that influences the green consumer's behavior (Finch, 2006). Moreover, Finch (2006) revealed that the functional value (price) influences the purchase of green products. In line with this study, Lin and Huang (2012) indicated that some consumers are so concerned about the environmental degradation that they are willing to pay more for green products. Gonçalves et al. (2016) claimed that functional value is not enough to make the decision to buy green products, while the absence of functional value is sufficient to influence consumers not to buy green products.

The above review suggests that different consumption values positively affect consumers’ purchase intentions. Therefore, the study proposes the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 6:** Consumers’ (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values will positively influence consumers’ purchase intentions.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

This study employed an experimental research design using quantitative analysis to test the developed hypotheses in the research model. This research approach was selected because the research model is developed for a causal relationship between independent and dependent variables, changing or manipulating independent variables into different groups.

This chapter illustrates the stimuli development, the fictitious four different ads created for the pretest and main study: (1) eco-product produced in the domestic developed country, (2) eco-product produced in a foreign developing country, (3) non-eco-product produced in the domestic developed country, and (4) non-eco-product produced in a foreign developing country; measurement scales, and the pretest procedure, results, and analysis before administrating the main test for this study. This study was reviewed, exempted, and approved by the UTK Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to the pretests and the main study (Approval No: UTK IRB-20-05750-XM) (Appendix A).

3.1. STIMULI DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of stimuli development was to create four different experimental conditions for this study: (1) eco-product produced in the domestic developed country, (2) eco-product produced in a foreign developing country, (3) non-eco-product produced in the domestic developed country, and (4) non-eco-product produced in a foreign developing country. To eliminate the consumer's prior experience with a brand, a fictitious brand was developed for this study. The brand was a new US jeans company, a maker of high-quality jeans products for the domestic consumer market and had the product manufacturing unit both in the domestic and foreign countries. China, Vietnam, and Bangladesh were chosen as foreign developing apparel
exporting countries, with one country randomly assigned to a respondent in the data collection. According to OTEXA (Office of Textiles and Apparel), China (33.6%) is the leading apparel importing country in the US market, followed by Vietnam (14.82%) and Bangladesh (6.47%) (Major Shipping Reports, 2019).

The study used the term US as ‘domestic developed country’ and China, Bangladesh, and Vietnam as ‘foreign developing country’. According to United Nations report on ‘World Economic Situation and Prospects’ classified country into three major categories (i.e., developed economics, economics in transition, and developing economics). The report ranked US as developed economics and China, Bangladesh, Vietnam ranked as developing economics (United Nations, 2020).

In this study, a country’s economic development status (developed vs. developing) and eco/non-eco products were used as independent variables. In contrast, consumption values (i.e., functional, social, and emotional) and purchase intention were used as the dependent variables. Two moderators, ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-products, were used to examine their effects on the relationship between independent and dependent variables.

A 2 (domestic developed country/foreign developing country) × 2 (eco/non-eco products) between-subjects factorial design was created to test the main effect (H1 and H2) and the interaction effects (H3). Next, a 2 (domestic developed country/foreign developing country) × 2 (high/low ethnocentrism) between-subjects factorial design was used to test the hypothesis H4 and another 2 (domestic developed country/foreign developing country) × 2 (high/low knowledge of eco-products) between-subjects factorial design was used test the hypothesis H5. Finally, H6 was used to test the effect of consumers’ consumption values on purchase intentions of the brand.
Figure 2 shows that four different experimental conditions were created in this study: (1) eco-products produced in the domestic developed country (US), (2) eco-products produced in a foreign developing country (China, Vietnam, and Bangladesh), (3) non-eco products produced in the domestic developed country (US), and (4) non-eco products produced in a foreign developing country (China, Vietnam, and Bangladesh).

3.2. MEASUREMENT SCALES DEVELOPMENT

This study questionnaire consisted of three sections: a consent form, measurement scales of the different consumption values (i.e., emotional, social, and functional), and demographic questions including gender, age, ethnicity, annual personal and household income, education, and so on. Consumption values (i.e., emotional, social, and functional) measurement items were adapted from the study of Sweeney and Souter (2001). The original scale of Sweeney and Souter (2001) also included epistemic and conditional value. Epistemic value relates to desire for knowledge of a product’s capacity and conditional value developed based on situational factors such as illness or some specific situation. Sweeney and Soutar (2001) argued that these two values were less important in the case of purchasing durable products. As this study measures the economic development status effects of eco/non-eco products which are durable goods, therefore these two values were not included in the study measuring consumption value. Scale items were measured using a 7-point Likert-scale response ranging from 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 7 (“Strongly agree”).

To explore moderating variables, ethnocentrism and the knowledge of eco-product, items were adapted from Cleveland et al. (2009) and Shen et al. (2012), respectively. Purchase intentions were measured based on the Chang’s (2011) study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product (Eco vs. Non-eco)</th>
<th>Domestic developed country / Eco-products</th>
<th>Foreign developing country / Eco-products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic developed country / Non-eco products</td>
<td>Foreign developing country / Non-eco products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Research Design
After constructing the questionnaire, a pretest was conducted with a convenience sample to catch any possible ambiguity in the questionnaire, check the manipulations, and assess whether the variables were reliable to be used in the study. Table 2 illustrates the measurement items used in this study.

3.3. **FICTITIOUS IMAGE CREATIONS**

To develop different experimental conditions initially, a few numbers of images were collected from online resources and sent to the committee members for the final selection. After approval of one most suitable image from the committee member and with the help of committee members, four different experimental conditions were created in this study: (1) eco-products produced in the domestic developed country (US), (2) eco-products produced in a foreign developing country (China, Vietnam, and Bangladesh), (3) non-eco products produced in the domestic developed country (US), and (4) non-eco products produced in a foreign developing country (China, Vietnam, and Bangladesh). As shown in Figure 3, the first left block consisted of an image of eco-/non-product and product economic development status. The bottom left block contained a non-eco product image and product economic development status. The top right block consisted of three images of eco-product and product economic development status (i.e., China, Bangladesh, and Vietnam). Finally, the bottom right block mentioned three non-eco product images and product economic development status (i.e., China, Bangladesh, and Vietnam). The eco-/non-eco product information was placed on the main label of the jeans. Three foreign developing countries, China, Vietnam, and Bangladesh were compared to see potential mean differences among them. The content of the retailer website in all conditions was the same except the information about the product’s economic development status and the descriptions of the eco/non-eco product information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Measurement Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Has consistent quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is well made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has an acceptable standard of quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Would last a long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Would perform consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. would help me to feel acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. would improve the way I am perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. would make a good impression on other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. would give its owner social approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. is one that I would enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. would make me want to use it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. is one that I would feel relaxed about using</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. would make me feel good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. would give me pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. [Countrymen] should not buy foreign products, because this hurts [home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country’s] businesses and causes unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts [countrymen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A real [country person] should always buy [home country]-made products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We should purchase products manufactured in [home country] instead of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letting other countries get rich off of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Americans should not buy foreign products, because this hurts US businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and causes unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts US out of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We should purchase products manufactured in the US instead of letting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other countries get rich off of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am informed about environmental issues in the fashion apparel manufacturing business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am knowledgeable about what eco-fashion is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am knowledgeable about brands that sell eco-fashion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chang (2011)
Four different experimental conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Eco-product produced in the domestic developed country</th>
<th>2. Eco-product produced in a foreign developing country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="100% MADE IN THE USA" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="100% MADE IN CHINA" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="100% MADE IN THE USA" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="100% MADE IN BANGLADESH" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="100% MADE IN THE USA" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="100% MADE IN VIETNAM" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** Four Different Experimental Conditions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Non-eco product produced in the domestic developed country</th>
<th>4. Non-eco product produced in a foreign developing country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Image](100%_MADE_IN_THE_USA)  
100% MADE IN THE USA  
![Image](100%_MADE_IN_BANGLADESH)  
100% MADE IN BANGLADESH  
![Image](100%_MADE_IN_VIETNAM)  
100% MADE IN VIETNAM | ![Image](100%_MADE_IN_CHINA)  
100% MADE IN CHINA |

**Figure 3.** Four Different Experimental Conditions (Continued)
3.4. PRETEST PROCEDURE

With the approval from IRB, the measurement scales were transcribed into Qualtrics survey for a pretest. After creating the survey design, it was sent to committee members to check the survey visual appeal and technical flow. Upon approval from the committee members, the pretest survey created in Qualtrics was transmitted via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) online survey for a seven-day period. When participants opened a link of the survey, they were guided to respond to three sections: a consent form, main variables such as ethnocentrism, knowledge of eco-products, different consumption values, purchase intention, and demographic information (gender, age, ethnicity, annual personal and household income, education). The content of the retailer website browsed by the participants in all conditions was same except the information about the product economic development status and the descriptions of the eco product/non-eco product information. Each respondent was randomly assigned to one of the four different treatments. Total samples sizes were 171 respondents (86 domestic developed respondents and 85 foreign developing countries). Besides, each respondent assigned to a foreign country was randomly assigned to one of the three foreign countries (85 Foreign developing respondents = Chine 26, Bangladesh 30, and Vietnam 29). Each participant received a $0.50 incentive after completing the survey. The survey took approximately 5 minutes to complete.

3.5. PRETEST DATA COLLECTION AND SAMPLE

The pretest survey recorded a total of 172 respondents. Among them, only one respondent was ruled out because of answered ‘no’ to the consent question. The demographic information (i.e., gender, age, income, racial/ethnicity, education, and employment status) was also collected and Table 3 shows the demographic information of the participants.
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Participants (Pretest, n = 171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency (n = 171)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work full-time</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work part-time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree (community, college,</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical school, 2-year college)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree (MA, MS, MBA or Doctoral)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$25,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001-$50,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$75,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-$100,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-$125,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,001-$150,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,001-$175,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$175,001-$200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,001+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6. PRETEST: RELIABILITY RESULTS

To analyze the reliability of the questionnaire items used in the study, Cronbach’s Alpha was used to measure each identified dimension's internal consistency and expected to keep the value over .70. Table 4 illustrates the reliability results of all constructs. All constructs ranged from .894 to .928, above the minimum threshold value of .70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Next, a manipulation check was measured to examine whether the four experimental conditions were created effectively to manipulate different levels of each of the independent variables (e.g., country’s economic development status and eco/non-eco products). The manipulation check question asked respondents to describe “how would you describe the given country as a country” and “how would you describe the types of given product you just saw”. Manipulation check questions both were measured using Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7. The frequency information of developed and developing country is provided in Table 5.

The result indicated that participants tended to perceive USA as a developed and Bangladesh as a developing country, but they failed to correctly perceive China and Vietnam as a developing country. As the manipulation check failed in the country’s economic development status in the pre-test, the definition of developed and developing countries were determined to be included in the main survey as follows:

“A developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country” (Surbhi, 2020).
Table 4. Pretest Reliability of the Constructs (n = 171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach’s alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of eco-product</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intentions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Frequency Information (Pretest, n = 171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Developing 7 = Developed</th>
<th>USA (n = 86)</th>
<th>China (n = 26)</th>
<th>Bangladesh (n = 30)</th>
<th>Vietnam (n = 29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“A developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country” (Surbhi, 2020).

On the other hand, there was a statistically significant difference between eco/non-eco products as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,170) = 4.485$, $p = .036$). The results revealed that the image of eco-products ($M = 5.53$) indicates high mean value in terms of non-eco products ($M = 4.99$). This indicated the participants correctly perceived eco/non-eco products in the image. Although this result was significant, the p-value was close to threshold. Therefore, in the main survey the following definitions of eco and non-eco products were included to provide clearer information about eco/non-eco products.

“Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products” (Tan, 2019).

Non-eco-products refer to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.”
CHAPTER FOUR

MAIN STUDY

This chapter describes the quantitative methods, analyses, and results. An experimental research design using quantitative analysis was used to test the developed hypotheses in the research model. This research approach was selected because the research model is developed for a causal relationship between independent and dependent variables, changing or manipulating independent variables into different groups. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), the process macro (Hayes, 2018) and regression analysis was used via IBM SPSS Statistics 27 to analyze the hypotheses developed in this study. The main test was administered using Mechanical Turk in the same way with the pretest except for adding definitions of a developing versus developed country and eco- versus non-eco products. The main study recorded a total of 541 valid data. The flow of this chapter includes data collection using Mechanical Turk, data screening and manipulation checks, the sample characteristics, the reliabilities of the scale items, and statistical tests that were conducted to test the developed hypotheses.

4.1. MAIN STUDY: DATA COLLECTION

With approval from the IRB, the measurement scales were transcribed into Qualtrics for the main test. After creating the survey design, the main test survey generated in Qualtrics was transmitted via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) online survey for a seven-day period only for the United States participants. When participants opened the link to the survey, they were guided to respond to three sections: a consent form, main variables such as ethnocentrism, knowledge of eco-products, different consumption values, purchase intention, and demographic information (gender, age, ethnicity, annual personal and household income, education).
At the beginning of the online survey, the participants read an introductory paragraph about the general information about the survey. Then they were asked by the participants’ permission to take the survey. If the participants disagreed, then the survey was terminated. Again, if the participants agreed to take the survey, they proceeded to respond to another screening question about their age. The study was designed for participants who were aged 18 or older in the United States. If the participants entered their age less than 18, the survey was dismissed. After passing all the screening questions, the participants asked to respond to questions about the moderators: ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-products.

In the second section, respondents were randomly assigned to one of the four different treatments: (1) eco-products produced in the domestic developed country (US), (2) eco-products produced in a foreign developing country (China, Vietnam, or Bangladesh), (3) non-eco products produced in the domestic developed country (US), and (4) non-eco products produced in a foreign developing country (China, Vietnam, or Bangladesh). The content of the retailer website browsed by the participants in all conditions was the same except the country that indicates a different economic development status and eco product type (either eco product or non-eco product). In each treatment, first the participants were asked a general question which indicated their general evaluation of apparel products made in domestic developed country (i.e., USA) or a foreign developing country (i.e., China, Bangladesh, for Vietnam). Next, the respondents were asked about the following: how would you describe the country type (either developing country or developed country); how would you describe the product type after seeing the image (either eco product of non-eco product); how much would you willing to pay for that product; questions about emotional consumption value; social consumption value; functional consumption value; and purchase intentions for the product.
The final section contained demographic information (gender, age, ethnicity, annual personal and household income, and education). After completing the survey, the participants were given a survey code generated randomly and had to paste it into MTurk to complete the survey participants' validation. Each participant received a $0.50 incentive after completing the survey. The survey took approximately 5 minutes to complete.

4.2. MAIN STUDY: MANIPULATION CHECK

A manipulation check was measured to examine whether the independent variables (e.g., economic development status and eco/non-eco products) and items of the ad responses to the four experimental conditions were reliable and would be useful in the hypotheses testing. Manipulation check questions were measured using Likert scale (country-of-origin: 1 = developing country; 7 = developed country and eco/non-eco products: 1 = non-eco products; 7 = eco-products).

The frequency information of developed and developing country is shown in Table 6. The result indicated that participants tended to perceive USA as a developed and Bangladesh and Vietnam as a developing country, but they failed to correctly perceive China as a developing country. Respondents perceived China as a developed country rather than a developing country. As the manipulation check failed to perceive China as a developing country so a total 89 respondents were removed from the data set. For Bangladesh and Vietnam, respondents who were rated 5, 6, or 7 removed from the dataset and used only the respondents who rated 1, 2, 3, or 4. Therefore, usable sample sizes of developing countries were 56 Bangladesh and 52 Vietnam respondents. As the same way, for USA, we used the cases that rated only 4-7 make sure the sample is only who rated USA as a developing country. So, the total sample size for
USA went down to 265 responses. Finally, the total sample size of main study consisted of 373 respondents.

On the other hand, this research model of this study comparing the effects of eco/non-eco products on the consumption values. Comparing eco/non-eco products manipulation check found a statistically significant difference between eco/non-eco products as determined by one-way ANOVA \( F(1,539) = 17.352, p < .001 \). The results revealed that the image of eco-products \( n = 271 \) \( (M = 5.69) \) indicates higher mean value than non-eco products \( n = 270 \) \( (M = 5.17) \). This indicated the participants correctly perceived eco/non-eco products in the product image. Therefore, the manipulation check for eco-/non-eco products comparison were successfully manipulated.

Later, as the participants tended to perceive Bangladesh and Vietnam as a developing country, a one-way ANOVA was run to check if there any potential mean differences on the dependent variables (e.g., emotional, social, and functional values) between Vietnam and Bangladesh and purchase intentions. Table 7 shows that the country (Bangladesh vs. Vietnam) has no significant effect on consumers’ emotional consumption value \( F(1, 106) = .104, p = .748 \); social consumption value \( F(1, 106) = .248, p = .620 \); and functional consumption value \( F(1, 106) = .156, p = .694 \). Therefore, developing countries, Vietnam, and Bangladesh, were not compared to see potential mean differences among them in terms of dependent variables (e.g., emotional, social, and functional values) in the hypotheses testing. Therefore, finally, these two countries combined as a foreign developing country were used in the study to test the hypotheses.
Table 6. Frequency Information (Main Test, n = 541)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Developing</th>
<th>USA (n = 272)</th>
<th>China (n = 89)</th>
<th>Bangladesh (n = 90)</th>
<th>Vietnam (n = 90)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Means of Main Effects of Product Economic Development Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Country-of-origin</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption value</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

After screening the main test survey dataset, there were a total of 373 respondents. The demographic information (i.e., gender, age, income, racial/ethnicity, education, and employment status) was also collected and Table 8 shows the demographic information of the participants. The demographic characteristics recorded a total 58.2% of the respondents were male and 41.3% were female; 43.4% respondents were between 30 and 39 years old, followed by 40 and 49 years old (24.1%), and 17.2% respondents were between 18 and 29 years old. Ethnic background showed the majority of respondents were Caucasian (73.5%), followed by African-American/Black (13.7%), and Asian American or Pacific Islander (6.4%). The majority of respondents showed work full-time (80.4%). Regarding education level, majority of the respondents (56.3%) earned a bachelor’s degree, followed by graduate degree (20.1%). In terms of household income, 26.5% participants income range was $25,001-$50,000 and 24.1% income was $50,001-$75,000.

4.4. MAIN TEST: RELIABILITY RESULTS

To analyze the reliability of the questionnaire items used in the study, Cronbach’s Alpha was used to measure each identified dimension's internal consistency and expected to keep the value over .70. Table 9 illustrates the reliability results of all constructs. All constructs ranged from .914 to .942, above the threshold value of .70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).
Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Participants (Main Test, n = 373)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency (n=373)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work full-time</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work part-time</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not work</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Less</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree (community, college, technical school, 2-year college)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree (MA, MS, MBA or Doctoral)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$25,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001-$50,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$75,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-$100,000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-$125,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,001-$150,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,001-$175,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$175,001-$200,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,001+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Main Test Reliability of the Constructs (n = 373)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach’s alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of eco-product</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intentions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. BASIC ASSUMPTION CHECKS OF FINAL DATASET

After the manipulation check the number of total respondents went down 373, but there was an unevenness of the respondents to each experimental condition. Among 373 samples, 265 were developed country (USA) respondents and 108 were developing countries respondents. To make the even sample distribution for the developed country and the developing country, a random sample of cases (n = 108) was selected from 265 US respondents using IBM SPSS Statistics 27. Finally, total samples became 216 and in each economic development status condition contain respondents of 108. The frequency of sample distribution shown in figure 4.

After selecting final sample sizes for the experimental design, a series of data screening procedures were conducted to meet the basic assumptions of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) and regression analysis. A total of 16 outliers were identified by using boxplots for univariate outliers and by examining Mahalanobis for multivariate outliers.

Next, multicollinearity between the dependent variables (e.g., emotional, social, and functional consumption values) was tested by investigating the variance inflation factor (VIF). As shown in the Table 11, multicollinearity was not a problem as the VIF values were less than 10 (Neter et al., 1990). Finally, the Q-Q plot was analyzed with the dependent variables to diagnose the sample distributions. As shown in the Table 10, the data distribution follows the normal distribution across the linear line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Domestic developed country / Eco-products (54 respondents)</th>
<th>Foreign developing country / Eco-products (54 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eco (108 respondents)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-eco (108 respondents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.** Sample Distribution of Four Different Experimental Conditions
Table 10. Q-Q Plot of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotional Consumption Value</th>
<th>Social Consumption Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q-Q Plot</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Q-Q Plot Emotional Value" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Q-Q Plot Social Value" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Consumption Value</strong></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Q-Q Plot Functional Value" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Q-Q Plot Purchase Intentions" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnocentrism</strong></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Q-Q Plot Ethnocentrism" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Q-Q Plot Knowledge of eco-product" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of eco-product</strong></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Q-Q Plot Knowledge of eco-product" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Q-Q Plot Knowledge of eco-product" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the data screening procedures, 16 outliers out of the 216 respondents were found in the data. However, outliers were found only for emotional consumption value, functional consumption value, and purchase intentions. No outliers were found in social consumption value or for either of the moderators (e.g., ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-products). At the same time, most of the outliers for purchase intentions were found for non-eco products made in foreign developing countries. As the participants were from the USA, they were probably denied the purchase of this product type. Multicollinearity and the Q-Q plot were also checked, but they showed no problems with the dataset. As there were no outliers found for social consumption value and for both moderators, these outliers seem legitimate data and therefore the outliers were included in the main analysis.

4.6. MAIN TEST: HYPOTHESIS RESULTS ANALYSIS

Hypothesis 1: A product made in a domestic developed country will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a product made in a foreign developing country.

A one-way ANOVA was run to test the hypothesis 1. The result shows that domestic developed country has a significant main effect on consumers’ emotional consumption value \( (F(1, 214) = 26.39, p = .000) \); social consumption value \( (F(1, 214) = 10.08, p = .002) \); and functional consumption value \( (F(1, 214) = 29.82, p = .000) \).

As shown in Table 12., the result shows that domestic developed country (USA) exert higher consumers’ emotional consumption value \( (M = 5.67 \text{ vs. } 4.87) \); social consumption value \( (M = 5.01 \text{ vs. } 4.37) \); and functional consumption value \( (M = 5.77 \text{ vs. } 4.97) \) than a foreign developing country. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was fully supported.
### Table 11. Multicollinearity Check (VIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enter: Independent variable</th>
<th>Enter: Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Value</td>
<td>Social Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.199</td>
<td>2.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Value</td>
<td>Emotional Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.309</td>
<td>3.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Value</td>
<td>Functional Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>1.772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12. Means of Main Effects of Product Image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Economic Development Status</th>
<th>Hypothesis test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption value</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>USA 5.67 Foreign 4.87</td>
<td>H1a: Supported</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>USA 5.01 Foreign 4.37</td>
<td>H1b: Supported</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>USA 5.77 Foreign 4.97</td>
<td>H1c: Supported</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypothesis 2:** An eco-product will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a non-eco product.

A one-way ANOVA was run to test the hypothesis 2. The result shows that the main effect of eco-/non-eco products on consumers’ consumption value were insignificant for all the three values (emotional: $F(1, 214) = .213, p = .645$; social: $F(1, 214) = .671, p = .414$; functional: $F(1, 214) = .400, p = .528$).

As shown in Table 13, the result shows means of main effects of eco-/non-eco-product on consumers’ consumption value. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 3:** An eco-product produced in the domestic developed country will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a non-eco-product produced in a foreign developing country. On the other hand, there is no difference in these three consumption values between non-eco-products made in a domestic developed country and eco-products made in a foreign developing country.

A two-way ANOVA was run to test the hypothesis 3. The two-way interaction of product economic development status (Domestic developed vs. Foreign developing country) and eco-/non-eco-product has no significant effect on consumers’ emotional ($F(1, 212) = 1.02, p = .313$), social ($F(1, 212) = 3.44, p = .065$) and functional ($F(1, 212) = .561, p = .454$) consumption value.

As shown in Table 14, the results show means for two-way interact effects of product economic development status (Domestic developed vs. Foreign developing country) and eco/non-eco product on consumers’ consumption value. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was not supported.
### Table 13. Means of Main Effects of Eco/Non-eco Product Image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Hypothesis test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eco-Product</td>
<td>Non-eco product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption value</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>H2a: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>H2b: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>H2c: Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14. Means for Two-Way Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Foreign developing country</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eco-Product</td>
<td>Non-eco-product</td>
<td>Eco-Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 54)</td>
<td>(N = 54)</td>
<td>(N = 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption value</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 4: Consumers’ ethnocentrism moderates the relationship between the product economic development status (a domestic developed country vs. a foreign developing country) and consumption values (emotional, social, and functional) in that high (vs. low) ethnocentric consumers elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values towards the product produced in a domestic developed country compared to a product produced in a foreign developing country.

Ethnocentrism was examined as a moderator of the relation between economic development status and consumption values. In the data collection ethnocentrism was a continuous variable and a median-split was performed to categorize the ethnocentrism (Median = 5.00) as a high group (Median > 5.00) (n = 111) a low group (Median < 5.00) (n = 105).

The process macro was developed by Andrew Hayes which is very suitable for conducting different types of regression analyses that involve moderation and mediation (Hayes, 2018). To test the moderation effect, the SPSS process macro (Model 1) was used among the variables. The result shows that the interaction term was statistically significant for all three consumption values. The interaction term was found statistically significant (emotional: b = .7097, s.e. = .3090, p = .0226; social: b = .8194, s.e. = .3786, p = .0316; functional: b = .6193, s.e. = .2929, p = .0356), indicating that ethnocentrism was a significant moderator of the effect of economic development status on emotional, social, and functional consumption values. The result of coefficient values of economic development status was found insignificant for emotional and social consumption values, which is different from those found from the main effect using ANOVA. But in the moderation effect, they calculate the unstandardized coefficient and standardized coefficient values, which are different than the sum of squares that are measured in the main effect. Moreover, a significant or non-significant unconditional
relationship between the independent and dependent variables is not a prerequisite for testing the moderating effect. Only the interaction effect measures the moderation effect (Aryal, 2017). Also, ethnocentrism divided into two groups (i.e., high vs. low), which are dichotomous variables, should have different slopes, which might have caused different results (Baron & Kenny, 1986). More specifically, the result explained a statistically significant increase in variance in emotional ($R^2 = 2.10\%$), social ($R^2 = 1.78\%$), and functional ($R^2 = 1.80\%$) values. Thus, hypothesis 4 was fully supported.

The results and line graphs of ethnocentrism as a moderator between economic development status and consumption values are presented in Table 15-20 and the simple slope diagram displayed in the below diagram.

**Hypothesis 5:** Consumers’ knowledge of eco-products moderates the relationship between eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) and consumption values (emotional, social, and functional) in that consumers with a high level of eco-product knowledge experience more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values towards an eco-product compared to a non-eco-product.

Consumers’ knowledge of eco-products was examined as a moderator of the relation between the eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) and consumption values. In the data collection knowledge of eco-products was a continuous variable and a median-split was performed to categorize the knowledge of eco-products (Median = 5.00) as a high group (Median > 5.00) (n = 134) and a low group (Median < 5.00) (n = 82).
Table 15. Results for Ethnocentrism as a Moderator Between Economic Development Status and Emotional Consumption Value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.8581</td>
<td>[4.58, 5.14]</td>
<td>.1419</td>
<td>34.2379</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development status</td>
<td>.3652</td>
<td>[-.07, .80]</td>
<td>.2217</td>
<td>1.6470</td>
<td>p = .1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>.0332</td>
<td>[-.39, .46]</td>
<td>.2174</td>
<td>.1529</td>
<td>p = .8786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development status x Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>.7097</td>
<td>[.10, 1.32]</td>
<td>.3090</td>
<td>2.2964</td>
<td>p = .0226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R^2 = .1555, R^2-change = .0210 at p = .0226

Table 16. Conditional Effect of Economic Development Status on Emotional Consumption Value at High and Low Values of Ethnocentrism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (Low)</td>
<td>.3652</td>
<td>[-.04, .80]</td>
<td>.2217</td>
<td>1.6470</td>
<td>p = .1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (High)</td>
<td>1.0748</td>
<td>[.65, 1.50]</td>
<td>.2153</td>
<td>4.9931</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5. Line Graph for Ethnocentrism as a Moderator Between Economic Development Status and Emotional Consumption Value.

Table 17. Results for Ethnocentrism as a Moderator Between Economic Development Status and Social Consumption Value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.0645</td>
<td>[3.72, 4.40]</td>
<td>.1738</td>
<td>23.3829</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development status</td>
<td>.0227</td>
<td>[-.51, .56]</td>
<td>.2716</td>
<td>.0835</td>
<td>p = .9335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>.7127</td>
<td>[.19, 1.24]</td>
<td>.2663</td>
<td>2.6757</td>
<td>p = .0080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development status x Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>.8194</td>
<td>[.07, 1.56]</td>
<td>.3786</td>
<td>2.1643</td>
<td>p = .0316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .1952, R^2$-change $= .0178$ at $p = .0316$
Table 18. Conditional Effect of Economic Development Status on Social Consumption Value at High and Low Values of Ethnocentrism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (Low)</td>
<td>.0227</td>
<td>[-.51, .56]</td>
<td>.2716</td>
<td>.0835</td>
<td>p = .9335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (High)</td>
<td>.8421</td>
<td>[.32, 1.36]</td>
<td>.2637</td>
<td>3.1931</td>
<td>p = .0016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Line Graph for Ethnocentrism as a Moderator Between Economic Development Status and Social Consumption Value.
Table 19. Results for Ethnocentrism as a Moderator Between Economic Development Status and Functional Consumption Value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.0226</td>
<td>[4.76, 5.29]</td>
<td>.1345</td>
<td>37.3495</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development status</td>
<td>.4425</td>
<td>[.03, .86]</td>
<td>.2101</td>
<td>2.1059</td>
<td>p = .0364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>-.1182</td>
<td>[-.52, .29]</td>
<td>.2061</td>
<td>-.5738</td>
<td>p = .5667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development status x Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>.6193</td>
<td>[.04, 1.20]</td>
<td>.2929</td>
<td>2.1144</td>
<td>p = .0356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .1470, R^2$-change = .018 at $p = .0356$

Table 20. Conditional Effect of Economic Development Status on Functional Consumption Value at High and Low Values of Ethnocentrism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (Low)</td>
<td>.4425</td>
<td>[.03, .86]</td>
<td>.2101</td>
<td>2.1059</td>
<td>p = .0364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (High)</td>
<td>1.0618</td>
<td>[.66, 1.46]</td>
<td>.2040</td>
<td>5.2045</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7. Line Graph for Ethnocentrism as a Moderator Between Economic Development Status and Functional Consumption Value.
The process macro was developed by Andrew Hayes which is very suitable for conducting different types of regression analyses that involve moderation and mediation (Hayes, 2018). To test the moderation effect, the SPSS process macro (Model 1) was used among the variables.

The result shows that the interaction term was found insignificant for all consumption values. The interaction term was found statistically insignificant for emotional (b = .0359, s.e. = .3172, p = .91); social (b = .4690, s.e. = .3703, p = .2067); functional (b = .4473, s.e. = .3027, p = .1410) consumption values, indicating that consumers’ knowledge of eco-products was not a significant moderator of the effect of eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) on consumption value. More specifically, the result explained a statistically insignificant increase in variance in emotional (.001%), social ($R^2 = 0.57\%$), and functional (0.91%) consumption values. Thus, hypothesis 5 was not supported.

The results of knowledge of eco-products as a moderator between eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) and consumption values are presented in Table 21-23 and the simple slope diagram displayed in the below diagram.
Table 21. Results for Knowledge of Eco-products as a Moderator Between Eco-products (Eco vs. Non-eco) and Emotional Consumption Value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.6829</td>
<td>[4.33, 5.03]</td>
<td>.1767</td>
<td>26.5048</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-products</td>
<td>.0537</td>
<td>[-.44, .55]</td>
<td>.2499</td>
<td>.2147</td>
<td>p = .8302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of eco-products</td>
<td>.8872</td>
<td>[.45, 1.33]</td>
<td>.2243</td>
<td>3.9552</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-products x Knowledge of eco-products</td>
<td>.0359</td>
<td>[-.59, .66]</td>
<td>.3172</td>
<td>.1131</td>
<td>p = .91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = .1341, R^2\text{-change} = .0001 \) at \( p = .9100 \)

**Figure 8.** Line Graph for Knowledge of Eco-products as a Moderator Between Eco-products (Eco vs. Non-eco) and Emotional Consumption Value.
Table 22. Results for Knowledge of Eco-products as a Moderator Between Eco-products (Eco vs. Non-eco) and Social Consumption Value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>37988</td>
<td>[3.39, 4.21]</td>
<td>.2062</td>
<td>18.4207</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-products</td>
<td>-.1220</td>
<td>[-.70, .45]</td>
<td>.2916</td>
<td>-.4182</td>
<td>p = .6763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of eco-products</td>
<td>1.2982</td>
<td>[78, 1.81]</td>
<td>.2618</td>
<td>4.9584</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-products x Knowledge of eco-products</td>
<td>-.4690</td>
<td>[-.26, 1.20]</td>
<td>.3703</td>
<td>1.2665</td>
<td>p = .2067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .2510, R^2$-change = .0057 at $p = .2067$

Figure 9. Line Graph for Knowledge of Eco-products as a Moderator Between Eco-products (Eco vs. Non-eco) and Social Consumption Value.
Table 23. Results for Knowledge of Eco-products as a Moderator Between Eco-products (Eco vs. Non-eco) and Functional Consumption Value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β (s.e.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.0927</td>
<td>[4.76, 5.42]</td>
<td>.1686</td>
<td>30.2076</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-products</td>
<td>-.3756</td>
<td>[-.84, .09]</td>
<td>.2384</td>
<td>-1.5754</td>
<td>p = .1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of eco-products</td>
<td>.5252</td>
<td>[.10, .95]</td>
<td>.2140</td>
<td>2.4538</td>
<td>p = .0149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-products x Knowledge of eco-products</td>
<td>.4473</td>
<td>[-.15, 1.04]</td>
<td>.3027</td>
<td>1.4775</td>
<td>p = .1410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .1134$, $R^2$-change = .0091 at $p = .1410$

![Figure 4](image.png)

**Figure 4.** Line Graph for Knowledge of Eco-products as a Moderator Between Eco-products (Eco vs. Non-eco) and Functional Consumption Value.
**Hypothesis 6**: Consumers’ (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values will positively influence consumers’ purchase intentions.

A multiple regression was run to test the hypothesis 6 predict consumers’ purchase intentions from Consumers’ (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values. These variables statistically significantly predicted purchase intentions, \( F(3, 212) = 382.229, p < .001, R^2 = .844 \). All three variables added statistically significantly to the prediction, \( p < .001 \).

More specifically, the unstandardized coefficient, \( B \), for emotional, social, and functional values were equal to .601, .093, .402 at \( p < .05 \), indicates that all the individual consumption values positively statistically influence consumers’ purchase intentions. Therefore, the hypothesis 6 was supported. The following Table 24 presented the regression analysis summary for different consumption values.

**4.7. MAIN TEST HYPOTHESIS RESULTS SUMMARY**

Table 25 illustrates the hypotheses testing results as below.
Table 24. Regression Analysis Summary for Different Consumption Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.439</td>
<td>[-.794, -.084]</td>
<td>-2.438</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>[.479, .723]</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>9.681</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>[.022, .164]</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>[.286, .519]</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>6.808</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R² adjusted = .834, CI = Confidence interval for B
Table 25. Summary of Main Test Hypotheses Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1:</strong> A product made in a domestic developed country will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a product made in a foreign developing country.</td>
<td>H1a: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1b: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1c: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2:</strong> An eco-product will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a non-eco-product.</td>
<td>H2a: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2b: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2c: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3:</strong> An eco-product produced in the domestic developed country will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values than a non-eco-product produced in a foreign developing country. On the other hand, there is no difference in these three consumption values between non-eco-products made in a domestic developed country and eco-products made in a foreign developing country.</td>
<td>H3a: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3b: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3c: Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3: Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 25. Summary of Main Test Hypotheses Testing (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 4: Consumers’ ethnocentrism moderates the relationship between the product country-of-origin (a domestic developed country vs. a foreign developing country) and consumption values (emotional, social, and functional) in that high (vs. low) ethnocentric consumers elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values towards the product produced in a domestic developed country compared to a product produced in a foreign developing country.</th>
<th>H4a: Supported</th>
<th>H4b: Supported</th>
<th>H4c: Supported</th>
<th>H4: Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 5: Consumers’ knowledge of eco-products moderates the relationship between eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) and consumption values (emotional, social, and functional) in that consumer with a high level of eco-product knowledge experience more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values towards an eco-product compared to a non-eco-product.</th>
<th>H5a: Not supported</th>
<th>H5b: Not supported</th>
<th>H5c: Not supported</th>
<th>H5: Not Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Hypothesis 6: Consumers’ (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values will positively influence consumers’ purchase intentions. | H6a: Supported | H6b: Supported | H6c: Supported | H6: Supported |
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. OVERVIEW

Consumers select a product based on numerous product characteristics. Numerous studies conducted earlier revealed that consumers in developing countries preferred products made in western or developed countries because their product quality is better than the quality of local products. Moreover, consumers are increasingly concerned about manufacturers’ environmental issues, and leading companies seek manufacturing sources for eco-friendly products. Although ethical consumers believe that eco-products could save the environment, some consumers are not concerned about the eco-products and thus select products based on other product attributes. Hence, it becomes very challenging for retailers to select a country among developed or developing countries to manufacture eco-friendly products and understand how the consumer knowledge of eco-product and ethnocentrism affects consumers’ perceived consumption values.

To address this problem, this study explored whether economic development status and eco/non-eco products influence consumers’ perceived consumption values and how consumption values influence consumers’ purchase intentions, considering different levels of ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-products. The proposed model of this study begins with the link between dependent variables (i.e., perceived consumption values) and independent variables (i.e., economic development status and eco-products [eco or non-eco]) and two moderators (i.e., ethnocentrism and knowledge of eco-product) between these two variable sets. The purposed model of the study examined whether the economic development status (a domestic developed country vs. a foreign developing country) and an eco-product (eco- vs. non-eco product) leads to different consumption values. This study also evaluated the moderating effects of ethnocentrism.
and knowledge of eco-product between the paths of independent variables, economic
development status and eco/non-eco products, respectively and dependent variables (i.e.,
consumption values). Finally, the study measured how the consumers’ different consumption
values influence purchase intentions.

The proposed model developed six (H1 to H6) hypotheses. An experimental research
design using quantitative analysis was used to test the developed hypotheses in the research
model. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), the process macro (Hayes, 2018) and regression analysis
were used via IBM SPSS Statistics 27 to analyze the hypotheses developed in this study. Based
on the findings, this chapter discusses the study’s theoretical contributions and managerial
implications. Lastly, this chapter completes with the limitations of the study and some future
research recommendations.

5.2. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The discussion of result findings of this study is described in four directions: (1) to
determine the effect of economic development status on the consumers’ consumption values and
the moderating effect of ethnocentrism between these two constructs (RQ1 & RQ5); (2) to
determine the effect of eco/non-eco products on the consumers’ consumption values and the
moderating effect knowledge of eco-product between these two constructs (RQ2 & RQ6); (3) to
determine the interactional effect of economic development status and eco/non-eco product to
influence consumers’ consumer values (RQ3); and (4) to determine how the perceived
consumption values influence consumers’ purchase intentions (RQ4).

First, numerous studies have been conducted on country-of-origin earlier and earlier
research suggested that country-of-origin effects has been one of the most studied phenomena in
international marketing. This study applied the term economic development status underlying the
term of country-of-origin which described the basic economic country conditions, human
development index (HDI), and GDP or GNI per capita. In this study attribution theory has been
employed to understand the consumers behavior from attributes or traits of product information.
Based on the attribution theory, this research model considered that consumers would elicit more
positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and (c) functional consumption values for a product made in a
domestic developed country than a product made in a foreign developing country. The result
finding reveals a significant positive response for all three consumption values. More
specifically, a product made in domestic developed countries produces positive consumers’
perceptions toward the emotional, social, and functional consumption values compared to
products made in foreign developing countries. Additionally, ethnocentrism which is a widely
used behavioral cue employed to measure the moderating effect between the product country’s
economic development status and consumers’ consumption values. The result shows a
significant moderation effect of ethnocentrism between these two constructs and more specific,
when consumers with a high ethnocentrism will elicit more positive (a) emotional, (b) social, and
(c) functional consumption values towards the product produced in a domestic developed
country compared to a product produced in a foreign developing country.

Second, a consumer study revealed that product eco-friendliness is an important criterion
to choose a product and they are willing to put extra budget for the environmentally friendly
products (Holbrook, 2019). Moreover, consumers are now demanding more transparency about
the product supply chain and are aware of every step of the fashion product manufacturing
process, as a result retailer are now taking initiative about the transparency in material sourcing
to enhance the product knowledge of the consumer (Euromonitor International, 2019; Yang et
al., 2017; Yoo et al., 2018). Hence, the research model employed a product either eco or non-eco
to see how they affect consumers’ perceived consumption values (i.e., emotional, social, and functional value) and knowledge of eco-product as a moderator in the relationship between eco/non-eco product and consumption values. The result showed insignificant for both conditions, which indicates a conflicting outcome with the earlier scholarly and market research (Awuni & Du, 2016; Buzzo & Abreu, 2019; Lin & Huang, 2012; Shen et al., 2012; Suki & Suki, 2015). At the same time, the insignificant outcome of this research showed similar results to other studies. Carrigan and Attallas’ (2001) findings argued that consumers pay little attention to product ethical consideration and show no interest in ethical product knowledge. Moreover, the environmental and social responsibility of the retailers had no influence on sustainable product consumption. Another study mentioned that consumers’ sustainable product consumption differs across different product categories because the same consumers do not use the same information sources in ethical purchase decision making (McDonald et al., 2009). Bray et al.’s (2011) study identified some key factors that restrict consumers' ability to consume ethical goods, such as price sensitivity, personal experiences, ethical obligation, lack of information, and product quality. Joergens (2006) argued that consumers show more ethical commitment when it has a direct effect on their health (i.e., food items), but unethical clothing has no effect on their health, so they are not concerned about ethical issues. Also, even though consumers are aware of ethical issues, their knowledge of ethical fashion did not significantly affect their purchase intentions since large quantities of fashion products are produced in developing countries. Cervellon and Carey (2011) claimed that consuming an eco-product or eco-fashion is not directly related to a safe environment and that consumers do not understand the meaning of all the terms and labels used to describe and guarantee green products. More specifically, knowledge of social issues and social value was found insignificant in its relationship to consumers’ sustainable consumption
(Okur & Saricam, 2019). Also, Yang et al. (2017) argue that sustainability and fashion are incompatible and create mistrust and confusion. Therefore, in the future, this framework could be used for different categories of products. Moreover, this confounding outcome should be reassessed in future studies in order to develop a new research design that incorporates new variables such as affective and cognitive attitudes towards advertisements of eco or non-eco products. These affective and cognitive attitudes can be used in combination with new variables such as consumers’ perceived environmental responsibility and environmental knowledge to better understand how these variables interact in impacting evaluations of eco and non-eco products.

Third, economic development status (domestic developed versus foreign developing) showed a significant positive response for all three consumption values. On the contrary, product types (eco/non-eco) demonstrated an insignificant response towards consumption values. As a result, the study results did not find any significant interaction effects of economic development status and product types on consumers’ consumption values. This finding suggests that the impact of economic development status (domestic developed country vs. foreign developing country) does not interact with the level of the product types (eco vs. non-eco) to influence consumption values.

Fourth, the study analyzed how the different consumption values influence consumers’ purchase intentions. The result finding shows that the consumers’ emotional, social, and functional consumption values significantly influence consumers’ purchase intentions of a product.

To this end, despite the insignificant main effect of eco/non-eco products and interaction effects of economic development status and eco/non-eco products on consumers’ consumption
value, the findings on the significant main effects of the economic development status on consumption values and moderation effect of ethnocentrism provide significant theoretical and practical implications.

5.3. THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

This study expanded the literature on how the economic development status and the product types influence consumers’ consumption values in several ways.

The economic development status underlying the country-of-origin is a widely published topic in the last few decades. Dinnie (2004) reviewed the literature of country-of-origin research from 1965-2004; Magnusson and Westjohn (2011) reviewed the literature country-of-origin from 2000-2010; and Dobrucali (2019) reviewed systematic the impact of country-of-origin on industrial purchase decision making of 43 studies during the timeframe 1970-2017. All the researchers reviewed the conceptual development of country-of-origin and the constructs underneath the research on this topic. More specifically, most of the studies in previous literature focuses consumers’ behavioral intentions toward a product related to country viewpoints founded on cross-cultural perspective, demographic characteristics, country image, country-of-design, country-of-manufacture, specific country comparison, and developing versus developed country perspective. None of the studies focus on the economic development status underlying the country-of-origin and product types jointly to measure consumers’ consumption values as well as purchase intentions, which contributes to the literature in the consumer perceptions of a product evaluation.

This research model contributes to the literature by revealing the moderating effect of ethnocentrism between economic development status and consumers’ consumption values while incorporating the moderator of knowledge of eco-products between eco/non-eco products and
consumers’ consumption values. However, the moderating effect of knowledge of eco-product was insignificant. Earlier, Magnusson and Westjohn (2011) found that ethnocentrism is a widely used construct to measure consumers’ attitudes in assessing consumer attitudes toward domestic versus foreign products. The authors in their study classified the country-of-origin moderators into four categories: (1) consumer traits, (2) decompositions of country-of-origin into multiple facets, (3) product attributes, and (4) product type. This research framework elaborates on the moderating effects of ethnocentrism behavior that have not been adequately examined in the extant literature. Specifically, the findings of this research contribute to the literature by demonstrating that high levels of ethnocentrism associated with a domestic developed country product show high levels of consumers’ emotional, functional, and social consumption values for the local product.

Furthermore, consumers are more conscious about material sourcing, materials utilized in production, material suppliers, and supply chain transparency, so they expect ethically and ecologically manufactured products (Shen et al., 2012). This study focuses on the consumers’ view of a product imported from another country while considering the economic development status of the country. Moreover, Laroche et al. (2005) mentioned economic development status of a country has a strong correlation with the consumers’ cognitive, affective, and conative components leading to influence product choice. The new developed framework simultaneously pays more attention to the two significant constructs of this research: economic development status and ethnocentrism behavior. Currently, consumers tend to be more globalized, and the effects of ethnocentrism on consumer perceptions differ when cosmopolitanism or xenocentrism are incorporated in consumer studies (Han, 2017; Oyserman et al., 2002). So, the result of significant moderation effect of ethnocentrism provides an academic contribution in these
different cultural values and has contributed to the literature of global supply chain industry considering the effect of economic development status and consumer ethnocentrism behavior.

5.4. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The present study results provide guidance for marketing practitioners in planning and executing successful marketing strategies for products and product manufacturing countries. These findings uncovered a significant result in the product marketing strategies for consumers and how companies take appropriate actions to mitigate the conflict of saving hundred thousand dollars in their marketing planning. Although ethical consumers believe that eco-products could save the environment, some consumers are not concerned about the eco-products and thus select products based on other product attributes. In line with this result, this study result found an insignificant effect of eco/non-eco product effects on consumers’ consumption values. Moreover, the result finding revealed that economic development status showed significant effects on consumers consumption values, but when examined the interactional effect of eco/non-eco products with economic development status, the results showed not significant. Also, the moderation effect of knowledge of eco-products is not supported between the relationship of eco-products (eco vs. non-eco) and consumption values (emotional, social, and functional). However, ethnocentrism showed a significant moderation role between economic development status and consumers’ consumption values. As a result, marketing practitioners or professionals must carefully establish marketing tactics such as offering supply chain transparency for each step of material manufacturing and strike a proper balance among different measures of economic development status performance so that companies expect to improve consumer behavioral intentions. At the same time, this study’s findings indicate insignificant results for
eco/non-eco products and a lack of eco-product knowledge, so retailers need to take the initiative to educate consumers about eco-product information.

Consumers purchase and consume products from different sources of country-manufactured products. This study's results demonstrated that the economic development status of a country when it is a domestically developed country significantly influences its consumers’ consumption values (i.e., emotional, social, and functional) compared to a foreign developing country. Marketing managers simultaneously pay more attention to the significant constructs of this research findings: product economic development status and ethnocentric behavior. Because the former has a significant and direct impact on customer choice of local products, whereas the latter has an important influence on consumption values. High ethnocentric behaviors significantly influence the relationship between economic development status and consumer consumption behavior compared to low ethnocentric customers. However, marketing managers who assume that all domestic consumers are ethnocentric are likely to fail to develop optimal marketing strategies.

As study findings showed consumers’ significant behavioral intentions for locally developed products, marketing managers of local companies should emphasize to local customers that their brands and products are locally made and sold to local customers to increase ethnocentrism and willingness to buy. At the same time, foreign enterprises should avoid emphasizing that they are international companies and instead highlight their cooperation with local companies. The significance of this study also provides practical implications for American fashion brands who want to successfully pursue market opportunities for ethnocentric American customers for US-made products.
At the same time, the study results showed insignificant results regarding eco/non-eco products effects on consumption values, and the moderation effect of knowledge of eco-products between product types and consumption values. However, ecological concepts in all business markets have important contributions. Managers need to think of different ways of marketing practice to enhance consumers’ knowledge of material transparency, material sourcing, ethical, and environmental issues. They can increase the use of social network activities of the company to promote the company’s goal, vision, and ethics, etc.

5.5. LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has some contextual and methodological limitations, which shed light for future recommendations. The current study used economic development status to develop experimental design between domestic developed and foreign developing countries. As a result, according to the United Nations report, this research selected the US as developed economics and China, Bangladesh, and Vietnam as developing economics (United Nations, 2020). However, the research manipulation check showed a conflict to define China as a developing country both in pretest and main test results. The consumers perceived China as a developed country. Further research needed to define the country’s economic development status based on level of income, currency exchange rate, consumer personal consumption expenditure, changing trends of economic, cultural, and demographic structure. The concept of economic development status needs additional refinement such as up to date GDP growth, GDP capita, export-import structure to achieve a stronger measurement of country-of-origin dimensionality.

Earlier studies of product country-of-origin have been conducted based on different product attributions; some studies used qualitative research to find appropriate products from a vast range of product categories, and some others used demographic, socioeconomic, or
psychographic characteristics to select the product category (Balabanis & Diamantopoulos, 2008; Pappu et al., 2007; Pharr, 2005; Samiee et al., 2005). As this study was conducted only for the general population of the US, future studies should be conducted targeting different boarder groups of people, such as based on characteristics of consumer buying behavior, income, age, generation, etc., in order to better understand the mechanism of economic development status and insightful outcomes of consumers’ behavioral intentions.

Moreover, this study may focus on future study to see whether economic development status and eco/non-eco, such as the low involved eco/non-eco versus high involved eco/non-eco or hedonic eco/non-eco versus utilitarian eco/non-eco product operates differently and may provide a different significant insight for researchers. Earlier studies mentioned that there is a lack of combination of qualitative and quantitative study. This research design is also developed based on quantitative perspective, in the future a mix both qualitative and quantitative may contribute a conceptual advance in the economic development status and product consumption values literature.

This study focused on three consumption values (e.g., emotional, social, and functional) as the main dependent variables to measure the consumption values from the study of Sweeney and Souter (2001). The original scale of Sweeney and Souter (2001) also included epistemic and conditional value. Due to research context, these values were not considered in this study. Sweeney and Souter (2001) argued that these two values were less important in the case of purchasing durable products. This study measured the effect of economic development status and eco/non-eco products on the consumers’ consumption values and the ad stimuli for the four experimental conditions were developed with durable goods. As a result, these two values were not included in the study measuring consumption value. However, these values have importance
in measuring consumers’ consumption values, such as for non-durable products. Therefore, future research should take these values into account when evaluating consumers’ non-durable product evaluations. This research result overlooked the effect of consumer characteristics to check the effect of economic development status and eco/non-eco products to measure consumers’ consumption values. In the future, consumer characteristics such as gender, age, ethnic background, income, and education may provide significant insights for researchers in consumer studies.

This current study shows the moderation effect of ethnocentrism between the economic development status and consumers’ consumption values. At present, consumers tend to be more globalized, and the effects of ethnocentrism on consumer perceptions could be differ when xenocentrism is incorporated into consumer studies. Future studies will broaden the research area by including consumers’ xenocentric behavior in this one. At the same time, consumers are now more conscious about ethical production, work-life balance of the workers, and safety issues of the workers, so in future studies could integrate or put more emphasis on consumers' social experiences to connect broadly.

This study focuses only on the US consumer’s perspective. In the future, cross-cultural studies should be tested among different countries based on economic development status to validate the findings of this study. Similarly, this study used only the USA as a domestic developed country and Bangladesh and Vietnam as foreign developing countries as representative countries of manufacturing, although some other emerging South American and Asian countries can create different perceptions about economic development status. In the future, research should consider these emerging countries.
Furthermore, the status of the economic condition of countries is not a fixed construct and countries change economic conditions over time. As a result, in future, longitudinal studies should be checked to verify the outcome of this study from time to time or build a trend of changing over a period. As this study's stimuli mentioned, the retailer is a newly developed company, so consumers were unaware of the organization's goals, values, and ethics. So, in the future, this research could be used by an established retailer so that consumers have good knowledge of the company's market reputation. Besides, in the future, multiple attention-checking questions could have been asked throughout the survey in order to reduce the number of unengaged respondents and improve the quality of the data. Finally, the survey was conducted during the COVID pandemic, so the responses may have been affected.
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You have individual responsibility for reporting to the Board in the event of unanticipated or serious adverse events and subject deaths.
Sincerely,

Colleen P. Gilrane, Ph.D.
Chair
Appendix B

Consent Statement

Consent for Research Participation

Research Study Title: Effects of country-of-origin and eco-fashion on consumption values: From the perspective of US consumers

Researcher(s): Md Mostafa Zaman, Retail, hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Dr. Youn-Kyung Kim [Advisor] Retail, hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

We are asking you to be in this research study because you have fashion product purchasing experiences. You must be age 18 or older to participate in the study. The information in this consent form is to help you decide if you want to be in this research study. Please take your time reading this form and contact the researcher(s) to ask questions if there is anything you do not understand.

Why is the research being done?

The purpose of the research study is to explore the effects of country-of-origin and eco-fashion on consumption values. Consumers are now demanding more transparency about the product supply chain and aware of every step of the fashion product manufacturing process. Therefore, we would like to broaden the understanding of how and why the US consumers make their product choice between products manufactured in the domestic country relative to a foreign country considering the environmental concerns.

What will I do in this study?

If you agree to be in this study, you will complete an online survey. Upon entering the brand website, each participant will evaluate the retailer brand on consumption values. The participants will be asked to answer questions on ethnocentrism, knowledge of eco-product, and different consumption values and should take you about 5 minutes to complete. You can skip the questions if you do not want to answer.

Can I say “No”?

Being in this study is up to you. You can stop up until you submit the survey. After you submit the survey, we cannot remove your responses because we will not know which responses came from you.

In case you are a college student, either way, your decision won’t affect your grades, your relationship with your instructors, or standing with the school.

Are there any risks to me?

There are neither physical risks nor foreseeable risks other than those encountered in everyday life associated with this study. However, possible risks include discomforts from certain questions in the survey. In other words, some of the survey questions are personal in nature and may make you feel uncomfortable. You can skip the questions if you do not want to answer.
Are there any benefits to me?

We do not expect you to benefit from being in this study. Your participation may help us to learn more about how and why the US consumers make their product choice between products manufactured in the domestic country relative to a foreign country considering the environmental concerns. We hope the knowledge gained from this study will benefit others in the future.

What will happen with the information collected for this study?

The survey is anonymous, and no one will be able to link your responses back to you. Your responses to the survey will not be linked to your computer, email address or other electronic identifiers. Please do not include your name or other information that could be used to identify you in your survey responses. Information provided in this survey can only be kept as secure as any other online communication. Information collected for this study will be published and possibly presented at scientific meetings.

Will I be paid for being in this research study?

The payment/compensation for your survey participation through the online research panel company (e.g., Amazon MTurk) will be issued after the completion of the survey. You will be paid $0.50 via the online research panel company after we have confirmed the survey is fully completed. Partial payment will not be allowed if the participants do not complete the study.

Who can answer my questions about this research study?

If you have questions or concerns about this study or have experienced a research-related problem or injury, contact the researchers, [Md Mostafa Zaman, mzaman3@vols.utk.edu, 865-298-6881 / Dr. Youn-Kyung Kim (advisor), ykim13@utk.edu]

For questions or concerns about your rights or to speak with someone other than the research team about the study, please contact:

Institutional Review Board
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
1534 White Avenue
Blount Hall, Room 408
Knoxville, TN 37996-1529
Phone: 865-974-6997
Email: utirb@utk.edu

Statement of Consent

I have read this form, been given the chance to ask questions and have my questions answered. If I have more questions, I have been told who to contact. By clicking the “CONTINUE” button below, I am agreeing to be in this study. I can print or save a copy of this consent information for future reference. If I do not want to be in this study, I can close my internet browser.
Appendix C

A Sample Questionnaire of the Pre-Test Survey
Dear Participants,

Welcome to the survey!

This survey is to explore the effects of country-of-origin and type of products on consumption values, asking about your different consumption values and attitudes about the products. The survey will take about 5 minutes to complete.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. You may decline to answer specific questions and withdraw from the study without penalty. Completing the survey will constitute your consent to participate.

All the information you provide in this survey will remain completely confidential. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

If you have questions or concerns about this study or have experienced a research-related problem or injury, contact the researchers, [Md Mostafa Zaman, mzaman3@vols.utk.edu, 865-299-9891 / Dr. Youn- Kyung Kim (advisor), ykim13@utk.edu, at 865-974-1025 or 1215 W Cumberland Avenue, JHB 244A, University of Tennessee].

For questions or concerns about your rights or to speak with someone other than the research team about the study, please contact:

Institutional Review Board
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
1534 White Avenue
Blount Hall, Room 408
Knoxville, TN 37996-1529
Phone: 865-974-7697
Email: utkirb@utk.edu

Thank you in advance for your time and effort in completing the survey.

I have read the statements above. My decision is:

☐ Yes, I agree to participate in your research.
☐ No, I disagree to participate in your research.
What is your age? Type your age in the box below.


Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in USA.

Negative  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Positive
Unfavorable ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Favorable
Bad        ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Good
Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans should not buy foreign products, because this hurts US businesses and causes unemployment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts US out of jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A real American should always buy US-made products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should purchase products manufactured in the US instead of letting other countries get rich off of us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am informed about environmental issues in the fashion apparel manufacturing business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about what eco-fashion is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about retailers that sell eco-fashion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm willing to make an extra effort to find a low price for clothing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will change what I had planned to buy in order to take advantage of a lower price for clothing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am sensitive to differences in the prices of clothing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't mind spending a lot of money to buy new clothes.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really cool clothes are worth spending a lot of money for.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario 1: USA Eco

How would you describe USA as a country:

- Developing country
- Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –
How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in USA?

[Blank Box]
Scenario 2: USA Non-eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in USA.

- Negative
- Unfavorable
- Bad
- Positive
- Favorable
- Good

How would you describe USA as a country:

- Developing country
- Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –
How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in USA?


Scenario 3: China Eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in China.

Negative  Positive  
Unfavorable  Favorable  
Bad  Good  

How would you describe China as a country:

Developing country  Developed country  
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –
How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in China?


Scenario 4: China Non-eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in China.

- Negative
- Unfavorable
- Bad
- Positive
- Favorable
- Good

How would you describe China as a country:

- Developing country
- Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –

100% MADE IN CHINA
How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product o o o o o o o Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in China?


Scenario 5: Bangladesh Eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in Bangladesh.

Negative:  🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi Positive

Unfavorable:  🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi Favorable

Bad:  🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi Good

How would you describe Bangladesh as a country:

Developing country:  🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi 🅽 kursi Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –

100% MADE IN BANGLADESH
How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in Bangladesh?


Scenario 6: Bangladesh Non-eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in Bangladesh.

Negative  O O O O O O O  Positive
Unfavorable O O O O O O O  Favorable
Bad        O O O O O O O  Good

How would you describe Bangladesh as a country:

Developing country  O O O O O O O  Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –

100% MADE IN BANGLADESH
How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in Bangladesh?
Scenario 7: Vietnam Eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in Vietnam.

Negative  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Positive
Unfavorable ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Favorable
Bad  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Good

How would you describe Vietnam as a country:

Developing country  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –

100% MADE IN VIETNAM
How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product          Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in Vietnam?
Scenario 8: Vietnam Non-eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in Vietnam.

- Negative
- Unfavorable
- Bad
- Positive
- Favorable
- Good

How would you describe Vietnam as a country:

- Developing country
- Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –

100% MADE IN VIETNAM
How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in Vietnam?


Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the product that I would enjoy.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would make me want to use it.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the product that I would feel relaxed about using.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would make me feel good.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would give me pleasure.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This product would help me to feel acceptable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would improve the way I am perceived.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would make a good impression on other people.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would give its owner social approval.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This product would have consistent quality.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would be well made.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would have an acceptable standard of quality.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would last a long time.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would perform consistently.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like buying this product.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel positive toward buying this product.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying this product is favorable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions will ask about yourself. Please check (✓), or write in the answer that comes closest to your own.

What is your gender?

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Other
☐ Prefer not to say

Which of the following best describes your racial or ethnic identification?

☐ African-American/Black
☐ Asian American or Pacific Islander
☐ Caucasian/White
☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American
☐ Other
What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- High school or less
- Some college
- Associate degree (community college, technical school, 2-year college)
- Bachelor’s degree
- Graduate degree (MA, MS, MBA or doctoral)
- Other

What was your approximated total household income last year (before taxes)?

- $0 - $25,000
- $25,001 - $50,000
- $50,001 - $75,000
- $75,001 - $100,000
- $100,001 - $125,000
- $125,001 - $150,000
- $150,001 - $175,000
- $175,001 - $200,000
- $200,001+

What is your employment status?

- Work full-time
- Work part-time
- Do not work
We thank you for your time spent taking this survey. Your response has been recorded.
Appendix D

A Sample Questionnaire of the Main-Test Survey

[Image of the questionnaire page with instructions and survey link]
Dear Participants,

Welcome to the survey!

This survey is to explore the effects of country-of-origin and type of products on consumption values, asking about your different consumption values and attitudes about the products. The survey will take about 5 minutes to complete.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. You may decline to answer specific questions and withdraw from the study without penalty. Completing the survey will constitute your consent to participate.

All the information you provide in this survey will remain completely confidential. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

If you have questions or concerns about this study or have experienced a research-related problem or injury, contact the researchers, [Md Mostafa Zaman, mzaman3@vols.utk.edu, 865-299-9891 / Dr. Youn-Kyung Kim (advisor), ykim13@utk.edu, at 865-974-1025 or 1215 W Cumberland Avenue, JHB 244A, University of Tennessee].

For questions or concerns about your rights or to speak with someone other than the research team about the study, please contact:

Institutional Review Board
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
1534 White Avenue
Blount Hall, Room 408
Knoxville, TN 37996-1529
Phone: 865-974-7697
Email: utkirb@utk.edu

Thank you in advance for your time and effort in completing the survey.

I have read the statements above. My decision is:

☐ Yes, I agree to participate in your research.
☐ No, I disagree to participate in your research.
What is your age? Type your age in the box below.

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in USA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans should not buy foreign products, because this hurts US businesses and causes unemployment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts US out of jobs.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A real American should always buy US-made products.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should purchase products manufactured in the US instead of letting other countries get rich off of us.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am informed about environmental issues in the fashion apparel manufacturing business.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about what eco-fashion is.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about retailers that sell eco-fashion.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 1: USA Eco

Developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country.

Developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country.

How would you describe USA as a country:

Developing country   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –

100% MADE IN THE USA
Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products.

Non-eco-products refers to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.

How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in USA?

---

**Scenario 2: USA Non-eco**

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in USA.

Negative  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Positive

Unfavorable  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Favorable

Bad  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Good
Developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country.

Developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country.

How would you describe USA as a country:

Developing country  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –
Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products.

Non-eco-products refers to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.

How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in USA?

Scenario 3: China Eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in China.

Negative  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Positive
Unfavorable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Favorable
Bad ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Good
Developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country.

Developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country.

How would you describe China as a country:

Developing country □ □ □ □ □ □ Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –

100% MADE IN CHINA

[Image of jeans with a tag reading '100% MADE IN CHINA']
Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products.

Non-eco-products refers to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.

How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in China?

Scenario 4: China Non-eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in China.

Negative ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Positive
Unfavorable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Favorable
Bad ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Good
Developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country.

Developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country.

How would you describe China as a country:

Developing country 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –
Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products.

Non-eco-products refers to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.

How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

| Non-eco-product | Eco-product |

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in China?

Scenario 5: Bangladesh Eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in Bangladesh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country.

Developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country.

How would you describe Bangladesh as a country:

Developing country  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –

100% MADE IN BANGLADESH

[Image of jeans with tags: 100% COTTON BIO]
Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products.

Non-eco-products refers to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.

How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in Bangladesh?

---

Scenario 6: Bangladesh Non-eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in Bangladesh.

Negative  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Positive

Unfavorable  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Favorable

Bad  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  Good
Developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country.

Developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country.

How would you describe Bangladesh as a country:

Developing country   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product:

100% MADE IN BANGLADESH

This product is made of COTTON.
Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products.

Non-eco-products refers to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.

How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in Bangladesh?

Scenario 7: Vietnam Eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in Vietnam.

Negative ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Positive

Unfavorable ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Favorable

Bad ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Good
Developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country.

Developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country.

How would you describe Vietnam as a country:

Developing country       Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –
Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products.

Non-eco-products refers to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.

How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

Non-eco-product  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Eco-product

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in Vietnam?

Scenario 8: Vietnam Non-eco

Please indicate your general evaluation of apparel products made in Vietnam.

Negative  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Positive
Unfavorable  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Favorable
Bad  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Good
Developing country refers to a country which is not fully developed but is developing in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses lower technological infrastructure, and has lower levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developed country.

Developed country refers to a country which is developed in terms of economy and industrialization, possesses greater technological infrastructure, and has higher levels of standard living and other facilities, compared to a developing country.

How would you describe Vietnam as a country:

Developing country  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Developed country
Suppose a retailer in the USA has launched a new brand of jeans. While browsing the website, you encounter a pair of jeans products that you may like. Please take a moment to review the product shown below and respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product –
Eco-products refer to the products that made from organic or all-natural ingredients and do not harm or cause any damage to the environment or surroundings compared to non-eco products.

Non-eco-products refers to the products that made from non-organic materials, are not environmentally friendly, and cause damages to the environment or surroundings compared to eco-products.

How would you describe the type of this product you just saw?

| Non-eco-product | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ | Eco-product |

How much ($) would you be willing to pay for this pair of jeans made in Vietnam?

Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product (refer to the image shown above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the product that I would enjoy.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would make me want to use it.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the product that I would feel relaxed about using.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would make me feel good.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would give me pleasure.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product (refer to the image shown above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This product would help me to feel acceptable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would improve the way I am perceived.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would make a good impression on other people.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would give its owner social approval.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product (refer to the image shown above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This product would have consistent quality.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would be well made.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would have an acceptable standard of quality.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would last a long time.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product would perform consistently.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your expectations of this product (refer to the image shown above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like buying this product.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel positive toward buying this product.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying this product is favorable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions will ask about yourself. Please check (✓), or write in the answer that comes closest to your own.

What is your gender?

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Other
☐ Prefer not to say

Which of the following best describes your racial or ethnic identification?

☐ African-American/Black
☐ Asian American or Pacific Islander
☐ Caucasian/White
☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American
☐ Other
What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- High school or less
- Some college
- Associate degree (community college, technical school, 2-year college)
- Bachelor’s degree
- Graduate degree (MA, MS, MBA or doctoral)
- Other

What was your approximated total household income last year (before taxes)?

- $0 - $25,000
- $25,001 - $50,000
- $50,001 - $75,000
- $75,001 - $100,000
- $100,001 - $125,000
- $125,001 - $150,000
- $150,001 - $175,000
- $175,001 - $200,000
- $200,001+

What is your employment status?

- Work full-time
- Work part-time
- Do not work
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Copy this survey code to paste into MTurk.

When you have copied this ID, Please click the next button to submit your survey.
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